

Mr. President, as the hour is late, and I know a number of Senators have left not expecting that this rather important amendment would be voted upon to-day, I will move a recess.

Mr. LODGE. Before the Senator makes that motion will he allow me two minutes?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. LODGE. I only wanted to say, Mr. President, that in my experience in the Senate the fact that a committee votes to report a bill favorably and there is no minority report never implies that every member of the committee is bound to vote for every amendment and every section of the bill just as it comes from the committee. It is the custom to reserve the right to offer amendments and to vote against an amendment on the floor. In this particular case that reservation was made.

Mr. President, as far as discipline goes I have never observed any attempt to discipline anybody on the Finance Committee. We have had great differences of opinion there and long discussions, more than in any committee on which I have ever had the opportunity of serving. We have done very hard work, and I think that there has been an abundance of independence shown, although no party feeling has been shown since this war began. I think, Mr. President, that members of the Finance Committee are perhaps quite as free from outside dictation as are some of those who criticize us. I have never observed any sign in the Finance Committee of outside dictation either from departments or from organizations which are in the departments. I have never seen any successful attempt to dictate to members of the committee.

I feel much honored by being a member of the committee on account of the work which it has done during the past year; and, if I may make one general observation, I think it is a mistake that it does not advance good legislation, that it does not advance that spirit which I think we all ought to have at this time in the Senate—a spirit of real unity—to make personal attacks on a committee and to jeer at it because most of its members have had the honor to be returned many times to the Senate instead of only once. I think it is possible for a man to have served long in the Senate and to give honest and useful service. I quite understand the feelings of the chairman, who has worked so exceptionally hard over the bills which have been before us, and who, I should like to take this opportunity of saying, has been so extremely considerate to all the members of the committee.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I did not jeer at the committee; I did not criticize them; but it is a fact that when an important bill comes on the floor of the United States Senate we find a committee like the Finance Committee voting almost solidly. That is so much required or expected of them that when a member of the committee says that he is not going to support a certain measure reported by the committee it is cause for surprise on the part of another member.

With 17 members of the committee voting solidly for a bill—that is about one-third or one-fourth of the Members who are usually voting—it gives very little opportunity for free, fair discussion and decision on the floor of the Senate.

I deprecate any attempt in a measure of this kind to bind 17 members of the Finance Committee to all of the provisions of the bill. My remarks were made to bring that fact before the Senate. I think it is a just criticism, and I cleave to it. I have no criticism to make of the members of the committee individually. It is their collective action that I find to be sometimes injurious.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the criticism in itself is the highest possible tribute to the committee, because there can be no higher tribute to the merits of a bill than that 17 members, from as many diverse parts of the country, representing two great political parties and several factions within each party, should come with a united front to vote for the bill as a whole, and with only, I believe, 2, or possibly 3, members expressing difference of opinion as to particular provisions of the bill. So far from the fact that a committee vote solidly for a bill being a reason to criticize either the committee or the bill, it is a proof almost positive of the fact that the bill must be one of exceptional merit or else that could not have occurred.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, as we are all making explanations, confessions, and protests, being a member of the committee, let me make one.

I have never supported either slavishly or otherwise everything in a Finance Committee bill since I have been here unless the Democratic caucus ordered me to do so. I have never yielded my convictions to a majority when it existed as to the

expediency or the right of anything which a majority of the committee thought otherwise about. I have never impeded legislation except on one occasion, and that was legislation reported by a committee with which I had nothing to do.

I have in the case of this bill objected to some of its terms, and have offered and have succeeded in having the Senate accept certain amendments which seemed to me to be desirable to certain parts of the bill. So I must deny the sweeping statement of my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] when he asserts here that this committee and all of its members slavishly follow the report of the committee, stand by the bill in solid mass, and obey the orders of the Treasury Department.

I wear no man's collar here, nor the collar of any committee. While I shall continue to do my duty on the committee and acquiesce in the report of any bill which a majority desires to report, or which it thinks it is its duty to report, I shall advocate and support its various provisions, provided only they address themselves to my better judgment. Otherwise I shall not do so.

RECESS.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 6, 1918, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 5, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Conden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, impress us as a people, with all the spiritual fervor of Thy power, with the stupendous task which has been thrust upon us, that every man, woman, and child throughout the length and breadth of the land may be impressed with the sacrifices, which he or she may be called upon to make, in the great struggle which confronts us.

Let those who can work give themselves with patriotic zeal to the necessities of the hour. Let those who can fight give themselves heart and soul to the cause. Let those who can minister to the sick and wounded and comfort the dying give themselves wholeheartedly to their calling, that we may defend with all the physical, intellectual, moral, spiritual power the precious heritage of our fathers—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—not only for ourselves but for humanity, after the manner of the Lord Jesus Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured.

### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured; referred to Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### READMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up House joint resolution 255, authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or allied forces.

It is a joint resolution which authorizes the readmission to the United States at the close of the war, or when they shall have been discharged for wounds or other physical reasons, certain aliens, notwithstanding the act of April 6, 1917, they having gone

into the Army of the United States or into that of the cobelligerents.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let the joint resolution be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917, excluding from the United States aliens who are likely to become a public charge, or who are physically defective, or who are contract laborers, or who have come in consequence of advertisements for labor printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country, or who are assisted by others to come, or whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, or who are stowaways, or who are illiterate, aliens lawfully resident in the United States when heretofore or hereafter enlisted or conscripted for the military service of the United States; and aliens lawfully resident in the United States who, prior to April 6, 1917, declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and who have enlisted for service with Czecho-Slovak, Polish, or other independent forces attached to the United States Army or to the army of any one of the cobelligerents of the United States in the present war, who may, within one year after the termination of the war, apply for readmission to this country, after being honorably discharged or granted furlough abroad by the proper military authorities, or after being rejected on final examination in connection with their enlistment or conscription, shall be readmitted; and that any alien of either of the two foregoing descriptions who would otherwise be excluded under said section of the immigration act on the ground that he is idiotic, imbecile, feeble-minded, epileptic, insane, or has had one or more attacks of insanity, or on the ground that he is afflicted with constitutional psychopathic inferiority, tuberculosis, a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, or mental defect, shall be readmitted if it is proved that the disability was acquired while the alien was serving in the military forces of the United States or in an independent force of the kind hereinbefore described, if such alien returns to a port of the United States within one year after the termination of the war; and that the head tax provided in the immigration act of February 5, 1917, shall not be collected from aliens readmitted into the United States under the provisions of this resolution: *Provided*, That if any alien readmitted to the United States in pursuance of the terms hereof shall at any time thereafter become a public charge the expense of maintenance and care shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman from Texas if this joint resolution, in part, does not cover the conditions provided for in a bill passed by the House yesterday?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No, Mr. Speaker; I do not think it does. I just talked that matter over briefly with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS], who is of the committee that reported the other bill. He can more clearly explain the terms of that bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I remember the terms of that bill very well.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This joint resolution treats of two classes of aliens in the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. If the gentleman will permit me, the bill of yesterday was to admit them to citizenship, and this joint resolution is merely to admit them into this country.

Mr. MADDEN. I realize that this joint resolution provides for men who volunteered into the service of the United States as well as in the service of the allies.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I did not catch the gentleman's remark.

Mr. MADDEN. The joint resolution says "those hereafter enlisted or conscripted for the military service of the United States and aliens lawfully resident in the United States." The question is whether that part of the joint resolution is not covered by the bill which we passed yesterday.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This is not to make them citizens, but to readmit them.

Mr. MADDEN. I think myself the readmission of men who have volunteered to serve in defense of the cause in which the United States is engaged, who have been in the country but are not citizens of the country, should be dealt with as a matter of simple justice through the provisions of this joint resolution, and there ought not to be any serious opposition to the joint resolution; but I was wondering, when I asked the question, whether it did not also include some of those who were covered by the bill yesterday.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That bill was to admit them to citizenship.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas whether, in case the joint resolution is considered by the House, he would consent to the elimination of the words, in lines 16, 17, and 18, "or after being rejected on final examination in connection with their enlistment or conscription, shall be readmitted"?

These words seem to give immunity to a man who has never been in the military service, whose application for military service must be difficult to prove, and for whom it would seem no special ground or favor of this kind was necessary or proper.

Mr. MADDEN. At the same time, if the gentleman will allow me, he did the best he could to surrender his life to the cause of the allies. He was in this country, he went abroad voluntarily, and if, after having done everything he could to get into

the Army, he is to be discriminated against because he did try to do the thing he ought to do, I think it would be unjust.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that this joint resolution is going to cause considerable discussion.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution has just been reported, and I would like to have some information about it. I think it should go over for a day or two.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. For the time being I object.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, when we completed consideration of the bill the other day we had just read the paragraph on page 17, ending at line 20. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he can inform me which of the employees in this paragraph are the barbers in the House Office Building.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Those are appropriated for on page 17, lines 5 and 6.

Mr. WALSH. Are they among the cloakroom men?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; they are known as cloakroom men.

Mr. WALSH. Is this one at \$600 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is one of them.

Mr. WALSH. He is a barber?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; and the others are carried at \$600 each.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, in line 4, page 17, to strike out the figure "8" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "7"; and, in line 5, to strike out the words and figures "one \$600 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent," and to strike out the word "seven" and insert "four."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 17, line 4, strike out the figure "8" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "7"; line 5, after the word "men," strike out "one \$600 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent," and, in line 6, after the word "and," strike out the word "seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I remember several years ago reading a speech delivered in the House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who at that time—I think it was during the Fifty-sixth Congress—directed attention to the enormous expenditures which were being made by the Government in order to support the legislative and executive branches of the Government; and he called attention to the various employees that were required and the salaries that were paid to them. It seems to me that in a time like this we Members of the House can afford to forego some of the luxuries, and I presume that these barbers might be classed as luxuries, because they are paid for by the Government, although we pay them for the individual services which they render when we are permitted to enter their establishment. It seems to me that we might relieve the people at large from this tax that is imposed upon them, particularly in view of the fact, as I said before, that we pay for the services they render; and I understand that in one of the shops there is one barber who receives no compensation except that which he gets from the Members who patronize the establishment. I understand that the others receive salaries, and it is presumed that the services which they render in cleaning up and keeping their shop clean and neat and tidy early in the morning and in the afternoon after they have closed the place is sufficient to warrant us in carrying them in this bill as cloakroom men, or cleaners-up. I believe it is time, if we are going to carry them as barbers, to say so and denominate them as such in the legislation, and let our constituents know that we are paying for barbers, even though they perform no work for us gratis.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I ask this question for information. Are the barbers in the shop here in the Capitol Building included in lines 5 and 6?

Mr. WALSH. I understand not. I asked first with reference to the barbers in the House Office Building, and that was the information given.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I gave the gentleman incorrect information. I understood the gentleman referred to the barbers here in the Capitol.

Mr. WALSH. No; I referred to the barbers in the House Office Building, but I intend to offer a similar amendment with reference to those in the Capitol.

Mr. HAMLIN. I agree very largely with what the gentleman has said, but I wanted to call attention to the fact that if the barbers in the Capitol Building are included in these lines, then they are charged with the responsibility of cleaning the Hall in addition to their barber shop. They are compelled to either personally come here each day and clean this Hall or else hire it done out of their own pockets.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the amendment that I have offered strikes out the barbers in the Capitol?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I intended to make that motion also, but I intended to do so first in reference to the House Office Building. Let me suggest to the gentleman that I understand that we give them the use of the quarters; we furnish them with the linen, with the light, with the heat, with the water, and that they come up here and ply their occupation, and each Member has to pay the same price for the work they do that he would have to pay if he went into a barber shop in another section of the city; and if the privilege which we give them to occupy those quarters, to ply their occupation there, to perform the services for Members of the House, is not worth their cleaning up the building in the vicinity of that shop and the keeping of that shop tidy and neat, then I say that we could afford to pay charwomen \$20 a month to perform that service in the halls approaching them or else impose that duty on some of the other janitors or messengers of these various committees that are overloaded with janitors and messengers.

Mr. HAMLIN. What I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to is to draw a distinction between the barbers in the Capitol Building who are limited to the membership of the House when they come to shaving anyone, who are not permitted to shave anyone else than Members—if Members do not keep them busy they have nothing to do at all—and the barbers over in the House Office Building, who have no other work to do except to follow their trade. These barbers in the Capitol Building have to clean this hall. The barbers in the House Office Building can shave anyone who comes along, while these barbers can not.

Mr. WALSH. I admit that possibly the barbers down here have a little more to do, but I do not admit that there is any justification for carrying this class of employees as laborers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that these barbers, excepting when Congress is in session, have practically no work to do in the barber shop, not only here in the Members' shop but over in the office building; there are a few clerks there, but they can not get any outside trade at all, especially downstairs here.

Mr. WALSH. But that has not been so for some little time; but even if they have no work to do I do not think we should carry them on the pay roll.

Mr. BROWNING. And that at that time they are janitors; that they have to move furniture and do all kinds of work; they are laborers.

Mr. WALSH. If Congress is not in session, it does not require any more cleaning up or moving of furniture or any more janitor service than when Congress is in session.

Mr. BROWNING. That is where the gentleman is mistaken. It is when Congress is not in session that the changing of all of the furniture in the building and the cleaning up occurs, and then they become laborers, especially those downstairs. I am not speaking of those in the Office Building.

Mr. WALSH. I submit if that be so we might transfer this troublesome task of moving furniture to some of these over-worked janitors at \$1,000 per year who are being carried upon the rolls for some of these committees that have not filed any reports, or have filed but few during this session of Congress, and that are not holding hearings, but I submit it is a deception to carry these men in this bill as laborers, and pay them as laborers at \$720 per year for one of them and the other at \$50 a month, when a greater part of their time is being devoted to their occupation of barbering and that they then receive the fees that are customary for Members to pay for that work. I say, as I said before, while it does not amount to

very much in the main, that at this crisis it is a good example for the House to set to economize here and there wherever possible within its own establishment and not let it be said that we during this war session, when taxes are being levied and when appeals are being made for every sort of charity, are not willing to economize and cut down in our expenses and to dispense with the services of barbers carried upon the roll as cloak-room men when a greater part of their time is occupied for their own private gain. If we give them the use and occupancy of these rooms, with the furnishings and equipment, it must be worth something, as to procure similar quarters elsewhere would amount to a considerable item in the way of rent.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. Does not the gentleman from Massachusetts think other barbers would be glad to have those stands down there even if no pay was given to them?

Mr. WALSH. I have no doubt plenty of competent men would be glad to have those quarters for a barber shop and to perform incidental janitor service as a remuneration for the privilege of performing such services.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. MEEKER. The gentleman is not retaliating and giving these barbers the same kind of a deal they gave when they got at him with a razor?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no; I do not know what treatment they give, as I seldom patronize them.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. GOOD. Has the gentleman considered this fact, that on the 4th of March next Congress will adjourn until some time in December? During that time this Hall must be kept clean. Other work around the Capitol must be performed by these four men. They can not perform very much work then and barber. They are not allowed to go into business generally down here and serve the public, therefore they will have no compensation during that time Congress is not in session, and yet they are performing a work here that the Government must have performed and for which it must pay.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman does not contend that these four men that he speaks of are the only ones employed around this Capitol or the House Office Building that can be secured to come in here and keep this Chamber clean when Congress is not in session?

Mr. GOOD. These four men are the only men on the pay roll, as I understand it, whose duty it is to keep this room in order.

Mr. WALSH. That does not answer my question. Does the gentleman say that there are no other men to whom this duty could be transferred? It certainly does not require as many to keep the House Chamber clean when we are not in session as when we are meeting every day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as explained by him, would be to dispense with four laborers now employed and who during a part of the day run the barber shop here in the Capitol. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, as Members of the House will recall, that in 1912 when this side of the House came into control there was a reorganization of the employees of this House and at that time 62 employees of the House were dropped from the rolls whose salaries aggregated \$82,750 every year.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. How many have been added since that time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. None to this particular roll. There have been some special police—

Mr. MADDEN. How many more employees are there in the House organization now than there were before?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman I am confident there are a good many less; there is not any question about that.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state as a fact that there are less?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are less, a good deal less, I will say to the gentleman, and I have no hesitancy in making that statement. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts proceeds on the wrong assumption. In the first place he proceeds upon the idea that those four laborers do nothing else but attend upon the barber shop for which he says they receive pay from those who call upon them for their services, but I want to submit to him and to the House that these laborers are very necessary. As a matter of fact if his motion should prevail it would be necessary for the House to provide four laborers in

order to do the work that these men are now performing at \$600 a year, and when we provide four laborers it will be necessary to pay them \$720 a year instead of \$600, that being the amount that is paid to other laborers.

Mr. DYER. That does not apply to the barbers of the House Office Building, but to those in the Capitol?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was speaking particularly of the barbers in the Capitol itself.

Mr. DYER. Those in the House Office Building do not do work as laborers.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed to the contrary; but the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts is directed particularly at the barbers of the Capitol Building, and I am confining these remarks to them.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MEEKER. This is a barberous discussion, but then there is one bit of information we have not got. Is it not true that the men of the House Office Building out of what they are paid pay the salaries of the two men here in the toilet room? Are not they employed by those men over there and are they paid by these men downstairs?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; they are not.

Mr. MEEKER. Are they paid by the men downstairs?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In the toilet room of the House?

Mr. MEEKER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are employees of the House and carried on the roll. Now, gentlemen, four of the laborers are employed in the Members' private shop in the Capitol. Their duties are, as stated by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], to clean up the House floor and keep it in proper condition, and that is what they are charged with doing every day. They work here in the morning, they work late in the evening, in order to get the floor of this House cleaned for the business of the succeeding day. I repeat that if you drop these four laborers from the roll, then it will be necessary to provide laborers to take care of this floor.

Mr. RUCKER. You have reference to the four laborers downstairs?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. How many months has the House been in session? It has been in session a large part of the time during the last four years.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. With the exception of one vacation, which ran from March to December.

Mr. RUCKER. There has been very little recess.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Comparatively; yes.

Mr. RUCKER. If it requires four men to do this work during that short time—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER. If it requires a forenoon of a day for four men to do the work, would it be necessary to employ four men solely for that work if they were changed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed by the Doorkeeper that if they were dropped, he would have to have four laborers to do this work.

Mr. RUCKER. Does not the gentleman know, as far as the work in the Hall is concerned, it could be done by one man?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. By two, then?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know; but I do know that these men are engaged, early in the morning and late in the evening, cleaning up this entire floor and galleries.

And I want to say to the gentleman, in response to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts, that these men get a certain amount of income by virtue of the barbering they do. Now, as a matter of fact, we know that their custom is necessarily limited to such portion of the membership as patronize them. And I venture the assertion if they were taken from the roll it would be impossible to secure anyone to come up here and run that shop.

The gentleman refers to the fact that they are furnished the room, the heat, the linen, and the light. That is true. A few years ago they were furnished their supplies, but that has been cut out, and now they get only the room, the heat, the light, and the necessary linen. But I submit if you undertake to remove them from the roll you will have to supply four laborers to do the work they are now doing, and in addition to that you

will not be able to secure men on the outside to come up and run the barber shop.

Mr. RUCKER. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see it tried once.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Has the gentleman any information as to how much time these four laborers occupy in cleaning up this Hall?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have not. But I will say to the gentleman it must take considerable time. It is a large Hall, and I dare say it requires considerable cleaning at the end of each day's session. I think anybody would agree with me in that statement.

Mr. WALSH. But four men are able to do it. They have the whole forenoon, when the House is not in session.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand they work at night frequently. This has to be done to avoid dust in the day. I will say to the gentleman that this arrangement has been going on for some time, and these men have been carried on the roll in this way for more than 20 years.

Mr. WALSH. That is not conclusive.

Mr. HAMLIN. I know very little about the barbers over at the House Office Building, but I made some inquiries quite a while ago as to the barbers in the shop in this building, their duties and what compensation they received, and so forth. Now, they tell me down there that they are compelled to clean this Hall, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] says, and I am sure it is no light job, because I have been through here when they were at work on it and I know it is considerable work in picking up papers, dusting, and cleaning the desks and seats, and so on, while Congress is in session. They tell me down there unless they come and do it themselves they have to hire somebody to do it and pay them out of their own pockets.

Now, there is another thing to think about. We will not permit them to serve anybody but Members. If there are a half dozen Members who come there to be shaved during the day they can serve them. Otherwise they get nothing at all in the way of compensation for their services as barbers. When Congress is not in session, I am told by them, that it is their duty to clean these corridors, clean the cuspidors, move furniture, and do every thing else incident to the work of a janitor, because they are carried on the janitor's roll and are under his supervision and control.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] says that that work might be performed by some of these janitors that are assigned to committees that seldom meet and have very little work to do. I want to say to him this, that I know something about one of those committees that does not meet frequently, but that committee does not enjoy the luxury of a janitor.

There is a janitor to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department in connection with the six or seven other committees. One man takes care of six or seven different committee rooms and carries the mail—the mail of all of these committees—for the pay of a common laborer so that it is not accurate to say, and I did not want the information to go out unchallenged, that these so-called expenditure committees have each a janitor, because we have not. We have one taking care of six or seven different committees.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMLIN. I will.

Mr. WALSH. I did not refer to any of the expenditure committees.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am glad to hear that, but I thought that inference might be drawn.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMLIN. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. In the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 14, running to page 15, there is provision made for 35 committees. The janitors in 12 of those are paid \$1,000, and those in the remaining 25 are paid only \$60 a month. Some of these committees, I notice in looking them over, are inactive and have no duties at all. There is \$3,480 expended. Why do we not make it a uniform charge and save that money?

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has suggested to me that you are asking the wrong man about that. I do not know about that myself.

Mr. ROBBINS. You are defending certain expenditures of janitors to committees.

Mr. HAMLIN. No. The gentleman is entirely wrong. I am only defending in a friendly way the barbers, so called, in the Capitol Building. I am not defending those over in the House Office Building who do no janitor work, as I understand. I only say that the small committees that I thought the gentleman from Massachusetts was referring to did not each have a janitor.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS], these janitors' salaries have been fixed by formal resolution of the House. If there is any desire to reorganize the janitor service to committees, it should be by resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if he will now indicate in this bill under which item the barbers in the House Office Building are carried?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are carried under the provision providing for "7 at \$600 each," in line 6. Two of those seven are those employed in the House Office Building.

Mr. WALSH. But there are three over there on the rolls, are there not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Only two on the rolls, and those two who are on the rolls, I will say to the gentleman, are charged with the duty of looking after the gallery corridors of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Do they look after all the corridors around here?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gallery corridors; yes.

Mr. WALSH. I move to amend by striking out the word "seven," in line 6, and inserting the word "five."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 17, by striking out the word "seven," in line 6, and inserting the word "five."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in opposition to the amendment. I want to ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to say that there are four barbers in the House Office Building, two of whom are on the rolls drawing \$50 a month?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not state the number from my own knowledge, because I have never been in the House Office Building barber shop; but I know that only two there are carried on the rolls.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There is a distinction made between those.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is because those who are on the rolls are required to perform service here in looking after the galleries in the building, an arrangement that has obtained for many years.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do they perform any service over here in the corridors?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They do. They are charged with the duty of looking after and keeping clean the gallery corridors surrounding the House.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. How did the others come to be there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are barbers. They are not carried on the rolls and do not receive anything from the Government.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman think it right—I am simply asking for information—does the gentleman think there should be two on the rolls and two off?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There is very good reason for it, because those on the rolls are required to perform services which are necessary and which are entitled to compensation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. On its face that appears to be a distinction; but I will say to the gentleman that I do not think the service they perform outside of the barber shop amounts to anything.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Some one has to look after the gallery corridors.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It looks to me as though it were a situation where two of the four are getting something that the other two are not getting. That is all. If they are, they should not do it.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman answer one other question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. How did the other two secure their places in the House Office Building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They secured them by permit.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it true that they are barbers and that the permit came from the ones that have charge of the House Office Building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That building, as the gentleman knows, is in charge of a commission.

Mr. DOWELL. And the commission grants this privilege to the two extra ones?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know whether they receive their permits from the commission or from the superintendent who acts for the commission, or whether they receive their permits from the Doorkeeper.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the Doorkeeper have charge of that room in the House Office Building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think not.

Mr. DOWELL. Then, there would be no reason for his giving a permit for that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it that the permit was granted because the additional men were needed. They are not on the pay roll. They serve the convenience of Members who go in there for a shave or a hair cut.

Mr. DOWELL. Would it not be possible to secure the services of two barbers in the same way?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That would be so if they were not needed for a distinct purpose, and that is to look after the gallery corridors.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman know that they perform this duty in the Capitol?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman have knowledge that these two barbers perform the service in the Capitol Building as janitors?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. In addition to that, when Congress adjourns for recess those men are required to stay here and continue to serve through the year as laborers, whereas those who are not on the rolls, of course, are free to go and secure employment elsewhere.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I might state there that the two men to whom reference has been made during the session pay the men to do this work here. They employ those men; so I was told by those men over in the House Office Building. When Congress is not in session those who were employed are discharged, and the others have to do this work.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: For clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, necessary in the discharge of their official and representative duties, \$2,000 each per annum, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners from and after July 1, 1918, shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House of Representatives and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid: *Provided further*, That each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner may appoint for such periods and at such rates of compensation as he shall determine within the said sum of \$2,000 a clerk or clerks who shall be subject to be removed at the will of the person by whom they are appointed, but no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year: *Provided further*, That Representatives and Delegates elected to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled, from the date of commencement of their respective terms, to make appointments and removals of clerks under this application: *Provided further*, That the employment of any clerk or clerks hereunder shall cease upon the death, resignation, removal, or termination of service of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they were appointed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order to the paragraph, and I make the point of order to all that part of the paragraph beginning with the word "Provided," in line 3, and ending with the word "appointed," in line 2, page 21.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am making a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the gentleman from Tennessee reserves a point of order on the entire paragraph?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I reserve a point of order on the entire paragraph, and I am making now a point of order against all that part of the paragraph after the word "Provided," in line 3, on the ground that it is new law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman in charge of the bill desire to say anything about the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say, for the information of the House, that in the colloquy which ensued the other day, when I was undertaking to present this bill, I made the statement that the amendment proposed was so drawn as to provide for elasticity in the payment of this fund for clerical help. In other words, that if the amount was not consumed in one month it would be subject to the disposal of the Member for clerk hire in any succeeding month. A great many expressed themselves as in doubt and some to the effect that they thought the amendment did not so provide.

Now, in order to remove any ambiguity it was my purpose, if the point of order had not been made, to offer the following amendment: On page 20, in lines 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, strike out, "but no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

*Provided further, That any accrued amounts remaining unexpended at any time during the fiscal year shall accumulate and be available for expenditure at any time during the remainder of the fiscal year.*

I hoped that the point of order would not be made against this section, in order that I might offer that amendment, and I bring this to the attention of the House now so that those who may be proceeding upon the idea that the amendment was not drawn as it was intended may understand that it is the purpose to correct it.

Of course, I concede that the whole provision is subject to a point of order, but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], in the point of order that he has made as to a portion of the paragraph, seeks to cut out from this section a provision which has been carried for a number of years. That is the provision that Members shall report to the Clerk of the House the names of those whom they have appointed as their clerks or secretaries. I am frank to say to you that unless the gentleman proposes to leave that provision in, then I shall make a point of order against the remaining part of this paragraph, because I do not think that the House ought now to undertake to cut out that particular provision.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will state to my colleague that in the event that the point of order is sustained it is my purpose then to offer as a substitute for the language which will remain in the paragraph the current law, which does carry the provision that the names shall be placed upon the rolls as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. In the exact language?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the exact language of the current law, with an addition to it which will make it permanent law.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will ask the gentleman, under the circumstances, why not strike out the whole provision and offer it as one amendment? I mean why not make your point of order against the whole provision and then offer the amendment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I should have no objection to that, provided we can be sure that the provision can be voted upon. Of course, the proposition is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say frankly to the gentleman that, so far as I am concerned, I would not be disposed to make a point of order against an amendment carrying the law as now carried.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, pending the decision of the point of order, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, may be read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee as a substitute for the entire paragraph:

"Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire, necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880.000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the

House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House and be subject to be removed at the will of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are appointed; and any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may appoint one or more clerks, who shall be placed on the roll as the clerk of such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointments: *Provided further*, That said amount of \$2,000 shall be the annual allowance for clerk hire for each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner hereafter to be paid under the limitations and upon the conditions herein prescribed."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is not offered now. It is read simply for information.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Simply for information. Mr. Chairman, if I may be indulged for a moment, I will state to my esteemed colleague from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that the particular thing in the paragraph as drawn, to which I object, is the first proviso, beginning in line 3 and ending in line 8. The reason I object to that is that it would change the system of payments. Ever since the passage of the resolution of March 3, 1893, which was the beginning of the allowance of clerk hire to Members, in so far as I have been able to find from a hasty examination of the statute, the payment has been made to the Member direct, and he, of course, has been at liberty to make his contracts with one or with any number of persons to render the clerical service required. That system has been satisfactory. It has been a system which has enabled the Member to proceed with least trouble in securing the clerical assistance necessary.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. DYER. Can the gentleman inform the House if he knows the occasion which caused the Committee on Appropriations to report this other provision to which the gentleman has made the point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean the one to which I am objecting?

Mr. DYER. Yes; the one to which the gentleman has made the point of order. Why has the Committee on Appropriations seen fit to offer that provision?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I assume that the Committee on Appropriations offered it because they thought it was right.

Mr. DYER. There is no doubt about that, but they ought to be able to give to the House some justification for offering it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman had been on the floor last Saturday, probably he would have heard the attempt I made to give some of the reasons.

Mr. DYER. I heard the gentleman's very able speech.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I wish to say this, Mr. Chairman, if I may be further indulged: Last year another legislative body somewhere in the United States essayed to become the guardian of the payment of clerical hire to Members of the House and put into a bill the identical provision to which I am objecting in this bill, and in violation of all the rules of that body the Members of that body were permitted upon the floor of that body to cast aspersions, not upon individual Members of this House but upon the House as a whole. When the opportunity came this House, without emulating that other distinguished body by violating the rules of the House, gave vent to its indignation concerning it. The proposition was stricken from the bill, and the system which had been in vogue from the beginning of the allowance of clerk hire was permitted to prevail, and was continued as the deliberate choice of this House of Representatives. The Committee on Appropriations now, for reasons satisfactory to them—I am not criticizing that committee—have brought in that very provision to which this House objected and which it insisted should go out of the bill.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman think that his intimated criticism of the Appropriations Committee is hardly justified in that connection? Does not the gentleman think that the reason why the House perhaps so overwhelmingly resented the action of another body somewhere in the United States was due to the fact that they felt that they were able to take care of their own business?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. HAMLIN. I am decidedly in favor of the provision, and yet I resented what another legislative body in the United States did last year.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; I will say to the gentleman, since he has asked the question, I do not think that was the only reason. I think the reason why this body resented it, and the reason why there may be some feeling now concerning this provision brought in by the committee, is that it carries with it the implication that the Members of this House



can not be trusted to administer \$2,000 per annum clerk hire as honest men. [Applause.] That, in my opinion, is the reason that Members resented it.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Could not the Members of the House, on the same argument and for the same reason, be intrusted with the pay of the other employees of the House? Is it any reflection on Members of the House that the employees are put on the pay roll?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish my secretary to become known as an employee of the House. I want my secretary to be my secretary. [Applause.] The employees of the House render service to the House, and the secretary to a Member renders service to the Member—officially, it is true; but service peculiar to the Member—and there is a very confidential relationship existing between the Member and his secretary. Many Members have entered into contracts. Members have different methods by which they have the service done. In my own case, if gentlemen will pardon me for mentioning it, my office in Washington remains open the year round. The secretary remains in that office the year round, except what little vacation may be taken for rest. While I am at home, therefore, I employ stenographic assistance there—perhaps this person to-day and that person to-morrow and another the next day. That is the plan which I have adopted. Other Members have different plans. Contracts have been entered into. The existing law is satisfactory, and it seems to me that the existing law should prevail; and it seems to me that it should be made permanent, because it is not now permanent law.

Now, I want to state—and I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will pardon me, but I happen to know that he personally has, ever since the beginning of his service, like many of the rest of us, paid out much more than he receives for clerical hire—the reason I made the point of order on this proposition was in order to be absolutely sure that that provision would go out of the bill. For that reason I made the point of order to that part and reserved a point of order to the remainder, in order that after this goes out on the point of order I can offer that which I have had read at the desk.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend from Tennessee that the same purpose which the gentleman seeks to accomplish can be secured by striking the whole paragraph out and offering his amendment. I am frank to say that if the gentleman makes the point of order to the portion he indicates I shall make the point of order to the whole paragraph. The gentleman may then offer his amendment, to which as a whole I will not interpose a point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am leaving enough in there to offer a substitute.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand; but I shall feel constrained, if the gentleman makes the point of order to a portion, to make a point of order to all of it so that the gentleman can offer his amendment; and, so far as I am concerned, I do not intend, and have no idea of, making a point of order against any amendment which seeks to carry the existing law. But I do object, I will say to the gentleman in all frankness, to that portion of the gentleman's amendment which seeks to make this permanent law. I am opposed to making it permanent law unless we place these clerks on the roll. [Applause.]

This is not a case for feeling; it is simply a proposition of whether a Member believes that they ought or ought not to be on the roll. For my part, I believe that they ought to be placed on the roll. The gentleman says that he wants his secretary to be his secretary and not an employee of the House. I submit that the secretaries of the Senators are paid from the roll. They are on the roll, receiving their pay out of the Treasury, just as, I think, our clerks ought to be paid out of the Treasury. Nobody has ever questioned the fact that a Senator has absolute authority over those who perform clerical services in his office.

Now, there is another thing which I wish to call to the attention of gentlemen of the House, and that is the fact that you are doing an injustice to the employee who performs the clerical service to a Member of the House, as compared to those who perform clerical services for the Members of the Senate. Why do I say that? Because if, as you expect to do before this bill is concluded, you adopt a general increase of salary applying to those who are on the pay rolls of the Government, that increase will apply to the clerical help of those in the other body who, as we all know, are paid vastly more for services they render than are paid to those rendering similar and equally important service to Members of this House, and will not apply to Members' clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hardly think I am violating any confidence of the committee when I state that it has been considered that the limitation to which the increase of salary will apply is \$2,000. The clerks to another body are mostly paid above that sum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say that as far as I am concerned there has been no limit as a maximum, and even if the committee had determined upon it I do not know what the House will do. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is anticipating when he says it will come in with a limitation of \$2,000. It may be more and it may be less. I simply threw that in by way of suggestion, as an injustice you are about to do to your own clerks. For my part I believe that the clerks ought to be placed on the roll, and certainly there is no Member of this House, not one, who is further from making the suggestion or implication that Members of the House are acting improperly, as was suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee, might be the conclusion drawn if this provision is adopted.

What are you doing in this bill? You place limitations upon your Cabinet officials. There is a small sum of \$30,000 carried in the bill for legislative reference, and this bill places a limitation upon the Librarian as to the manner in which he shall expend it and as to the amount of salary that he may pay under that appropriation. Does the Librarian think that that is an implication in respect to his honesty of purpose? Is there any Member of this House who votes for it with the idea that the Librarian would act improperly if we would leave that fund to him without the limitation upon it? You can go through this bill from one end to the other and you will find many, many limitations placed upon Cabinet officials. Is that an implication or an insinuation against them as to the manner in which they would act if left free? Certainly not. Then why should Members who oppose this provision choose to construe it as an implication against them? Then why should Members who oppose this provision choose to regard it as an implication against themselves? There is not an appropriation bill that is passed by the House that does not carry some sort of limitation upon it, limiting those who have charge of the expenditure, and yet this is the first time that it has ever been suggested that a limitation of this kind serves as an imputation of dishonesty upon those having charge of its administration.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman realize the difference between the House and the Senate in this particular? In the Senate each committee is provided with a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger, so that the chairman of each Senate committee has three clerks, practically, and this bill carries a provision that each Senator who is not the chairman of a committee shall have a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger, whereas by this requirement you practically make it imperative that a House Member have only one clerk?

A Member is not at liberty to split up and divide his allowance—oh, theoretically he can, but practically he is limited to paying it to one person and must go into his own pocket for anything paid to additional assistants. There is a difference between the Senate and the House in that respect. Each Senator has at least three persons in his office to help him, whereas a Member of the House has but one. He needs two.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman in the first place that there is no limitation upon any Member in respect to the number of clerks he may employ out of the \$2,000 allowed for clerical hire, and if the gentleman had listened to the amendment I proposed to offer a moment ago—

Mr. TILSON. I heard it read.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He would understand that if the House is willing to adopt it it will provide that a Member may expend the \$2,000 just as he pleases during the fiscal year, the only difference being that he puts his secretary or secretaries upon the pay roll. The people of this country do not object to giving to the Members of the House every particle of clerical assistance that they need for the prompt and efficient administration of their duties here. The people of the country want the membership of the House to have sufficient clerical assistance.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman not know that Members of this House have not sufficient clerical help? Does he not know that their work is greatly hampered for lack of clerical assistance, especially since the war began. That is the fact so far as the membership of the House is concerned, and the people of this country who know anything about the duties of a Member of Congress know it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I want to say this, in continuance of what I started to say, that they do not object to it, but



I do believe that before this House undertakes to increase its appropriation for clerical help it ought to place the secretaries upon the pay roll. That was one reason why a year ago I voted against the increase that was given at that time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Connecticut has called attention to the fact that Members of the House did not have sufficient clerical assistance. Is the gentleman aware that there are 17 or 18 committees of the House whose clerks are also the secretaries of the Members?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are about 60 committees in the House, I think.

Mr. WALSH. But there are 17 or 18 of those whose clerk is also the secretary of the Member. They have time enough to act as clerk of the committee.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman realize that since this war began the clerical work of the Congressman has doubled to what it was?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know that is largely true, and I know, as a matter of fact, as my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] stated, that there are very many Members of this House, possibly all of them so far as I know, who have to pay out much more money than they get for clerical assistance.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say to the gentleman that I am compelled to employ not only my secretary but two others, the work has increased to such an extent, and it is desired to split this matter up. You can not afford to pay it all out of your own pocket. All of us pay out a large sum as it is. The exigencies of this war, it seems to me, demand that this ought not to be interfered with at this time, at least until we can get other help.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not see how the exigency of the war has anything to do with the question of whether or not those who are employed to render clerical assistance to Members shall be paid for their services directly by the Government.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is almost impossible to get stenographers. If you get one, you will have her for only two or three weeks, and then she goes into the Government service, and you are changing almost monthly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope if the gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that he will make it to the entire paragraph.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that part that I indicated. I reserve the point of order as to the whole.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee is directed to all the matter beginning on line 24 with the word "provided," page 20, and continuing down to and including the word "appointed," in line 2 on page 21.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, the basic law in this matter is simply a provision of law that a definite amount may be appropriated for clerk hire for the Members of the House.

The fact that matter subject to a point of order is carried from year to year in an appropriation bill gives it no status against a point of order when it is raised. The fact that it goes over from time to time without objection does not prevent the objection being proper to be made and one to be sustained when it actually is made. Now, the gentleman from Tennessee directs, as I have said, his point of order to all the matter included within the limits stated. All of that matter is legislation, and very plainly it is all out of order, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the remaining language, and I want to say in explanation of what I intend to do that I shall make the point of order against the remaining language in view of the fact that the gentleman from Tennessee has said that it is his purpose to offer an amendment which will take care of the clerical help. There will therefore be no danger of Members being deprived of the clerical assistance they are now receiving.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry? Would the gentleman be willing to submit that matter to a vote of the membership?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman and other Members of the House will submit to the House the proposition to place secretaries upon the roll I will gladly do so, and that is what I want.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that has been voted on here ever since I have been a Member.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon; it has not.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman does not need to beg my pardon; I have been here and I know.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will gladly submit to a vote if the gentleman and other Members permit.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I have no objection to it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If I understand the gentleman from Tennessee, he states that if the House be permitted to have a vote upon the proposition involved in his bill placing them upon the roll that he then will not make the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; if we can have a vote in the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not in the Committee of the Whole House. The gentleman will insist upon a vote in the House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have no objection if we can arrange a parliamentary way of getting at it, but I do not see exactly how to get at it in a parliamentary way.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can tell the gentleman how to get at it, although the gentleman is a better parliamentarian than I am. If the gentleman will not make the point of order on this paragraph as reported by the committee and will propose in addition thereto the language he wishes to insert in lieu of that portion of this amendment reported by the committee to which he offers objection, it will afford opportunity in the House to get a roll call.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Would not this be satisfactory to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say if the gentleman does not make the point of order I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let us see if we can arrive at some conclusion on this. I will say this: I do not know whether Members have investigated the matter or not, but if I may be permitted a minute, it does seem to me, let me say, that there ought to be some means devised by which this annual recurring trouble over this clerical hire could be dispensed with.

Mr. DOWELL. Put them on the roll and that will settle it. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That might settle it to the satisfaction of the gentleman, but it does not settle it to the satisfaction of a great many other gentlemen. They are on the roll now, I will say to the gentleman, under the law. A Member is required to make profert of those whom he appoints regularly as clerical help. I am not objecting to that. What I am objecting to is the change in the system of payments.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. It was suggested that we put them on the roll and do away with the annual controversy. I say if we put them on the roll it will just result in adding one new clerk every year until they get so many clerks, because you are not required to pay them out of what you receive, that there will be a scandal about it. That is the situation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In all probability that would be the result. What I was about to say was this: I am extremely anxious that if possible we may in some way get away from this annual worry and embarrassment concerning this question, and if we can arrange a way whereby the gentleman from Tennessee can have a vote upon the proposition I am willing myself to withdraw my point of order and offer a substitute for the proposition. If it then be adopted, the gentleman from Tennessee can demand a separate vote in the House upon that and have a roll call. Will that be satisfactory to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have just indicated my desire to perfect the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I should be willing if we can have an agreement whereby I withdraw the point of order, the gentleman offers the amendment to perfect in the way he desires, and then I offer my proposition as a substitute, and if it be adopted in committee then the gentleman can have a roll call in the House by demanding a separate vote.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit, I for one take exception to the language the committee has used in framing this paragraph, and if the gentleman does not make the point of order I shall.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What particular language?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I object to nearly all the language and the imputations in the language. It may not be—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman has talked for half an hour, and will he permit some one else to talk for a minute? If the gentleman can frame language that will not be an



insult and will accomplish what he wants. I will not make the point of order. But the language as it stands—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman takes exception to the language. I fail to see anything in the language that carries the slightest imputation.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I see it and others see it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is in the habit of offering amendments. What would the gentleman offer?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is sufficiently able to take care of himself. It is easy enough to draw language that does not contain any imputation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I insist on my point of order, Mr. Chairman, to removing part of the paragraph so that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] can offer his amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order. The point of order is made to the remainder of the paragraph. I presume it is on the ground that the salaries contained in the remaining language are in excess of that afforded by the basic law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for the submission of an amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the sustaining of the point of order now wipe out the appropriation itself?

The CHAIRMAN. In its present form. It is perfectly competent to offer an amendment in conformity with the basic law. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, after line 23, insert:

"To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire, necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum in monthly installments, \$800,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I grant that to the extent of the salary that is stated, \$2,000, it is subject to a point of order. Other than that I contend it is not subject to the point of order, because prior law has authorized the employment of clerks to Members of the House. The basic law is at present \$1,200 for our clerk hire. If the chairman of the committee wishes, in view of the action taken by this body last year, to make the point of order to the amount that the Members of the House should use for the employment of clerk hire, it is his privilege to do so. I perform my duty in offering this amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that. If the gentleman will offer the current law, I will not do it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin, the Chair understands, has an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does that rule apply? I know the gentleman has the right to the floor, but can he keep the floor indefinitely?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not going to let any one Member keep the floor for an indefinite time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD offers the following amendment: Insert the following: "Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House and be subject to be removed at the will of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are appointed; and any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may appoint one or more clerks, who shall be placed on the roll as the clerk of such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointments."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read by the Clerk is the language in the existing law that was incorporated in the bill last year. It makes no change whatsoever, and does not make it permanent law, but merely carries for the next fiscal year the same appropriation under the same conditions as the existing appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not that go further than existing law in this, that it requires the Member to register the names of all persons employed by him to assist in his office? What I want to avoid is the necessity of reporting to somebody the name of every person employed by a Member to conduct his clerical work, his seed distribution, and similar matters—per diem employees. I passed the office of one Member yesterday who had no less than 11 persons employed addressing material. They were evidently on a per diem pay roll and at his own expense, because his secretary needed the help.

A Member of the House ought to have jurisdiction over this \$2,000. I am perfectly willing to have the name of the secretary reported to somebody if the conscience of the House thinks that is necessary to meet public criticism. But the idea of being accountable to somebody for every person that may be employed throughout the year on various jobs which come under the designation of clerk hire seems to me supremely ridiculous in the first place and a direct reflection upon the integrity of the Member in the other.

Documents have to be sent out, as the gentleman knows; seed have to be sent out—few secretaries do that single handed—and there are some Members who have to employ from one to three and four assistants; some of them regularly. Does not the gentleman's amendment require that each Member shall keep an account of all money spent in this way—enter it up and report it here to somebody? That, I think, is an unnecessary requirement.

Mr. STAFFORD. The fear of the gentleman in making an accounting is not involved in the amendment here proposed. This amendment is existing law, and under it Members are required merely to report to the Clerk of the House the names of the clerks who are the recipients of this fund. The construction of this statute does not place any undue hardship upon the Members in the payment of the fund to the respective employees whom they require for their clerical service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for two minutes more, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks for two minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I attempted to offer an amendment whereby the amount should be \$2,000 per annum, payable in monthly installments without any restriction whatsoever. My purpose was that Members would be certain to secure \$2,000, and not be deprived of that amount for their use during the next fiscal year. The Chairman of the subcommittee having this bill in charge made a point of order to that and stated he would not make the point of order to the existing law, and I am offering the existing law so that we all may continue during the next fiscal year under the same terms and practice as in the past.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Do I understand that the amendment offered by the gentleman is the existing law?

Mr. STAFFORD. Exactly, word for word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And does not necessitate the detailed accounting to which I referred?

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. If I have time.

Mr. DYER. I would like to ask the gentleman as a member of the committee if he can say, representing the judgment of himself and the committee, if this matter is allowed to pass without a point of order, we will have no repetition of this unseemly performance in the next Congress and forever after?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can make no predictions as to the future.

Mr. DYER. I ask for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. I think the House is thoroughly sick of this unseemly performance. I hope this will be the end.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserved this point of order for a purpose. I do not know whether I can develop the purpose for which I really reserved it or not.

First, I desire most earnestly to say that I was in favor of the original language placed in the bill by the committee. I am utterly at a loss, utterly unable to read the English language, when I would undertake to read into the provision reported by the committee an aspersion on any Member of this House. Not a right is taken from him; not a privilege is taken from him. He can put on the roll whomsoever he pleases, and let his clerk get his own or her own money. He can put on more than one, if he wants to, and they can get their money.

It has happened to me more than once—and I dare say it has happened to many Members on the floor of the House in the same way—particularly during the campaign time, when I am absent from my home and my residence for two or three weeks at a time, campaigning in my district, that my secretary, who really needs her check, which may be lying in my office at the time at my home city, is unable to get her money until I return and indorse that check. Gentlemen seem to look upon that rather lightly. It may be that I am an exception to the rule. If I am, I am nevertheless stating exactly what has occurred to me on more than one occasion.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. For a question.

Mr. REAVIS. I think that has occurred to every Member, who merely indorses the check and turns it over to his secretary.

Mr. COX. I take it, and I assume that every Member of this House indorses his check and turns it over to his private secretary. I hope that I am not exercising myself in a violent assumption when I thus make that statement.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I will say to the gentleman that I never saw one of these checks in my life. My secretary signs my name to it and goes and gets it cashed.

Mr. COX. My secretary signs my name to a lot of letters, but I will not let my secretary, though I have undoubted confidence in her honesty, sign my name to a check. I will not let any mortal do that except my wife.

Mr. RUCKER. But it is the secretary's check.

Mr. COX. But I must indorse that before she can cash it.

Mr. KEARNS. It is her own money, is it not?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. What is the difference, then, if she signs for it?

Mr. COX. There is a vast difference. I say, I assume that every Member of this House indorses the check and turns it over to the secretary. I assume, and have a right to assume, that every Member of this House has a private secretary somewhere, and that he is turning over every dollar of that money to the private secretary. Otherwise he is not entitled to the money. I am not here to cast aspersions on any Member of this House. I say, I assume that they do that; in fact, I think they do.

Now, then, gentlemen, this provision came up here last session and it was kicked out. The objection was that the Senate interfered with our prerogatives. That was the objection to it then. We first refused to accede to the Senate amendment, and then the leader on that side [Mr. MANN], moved to adhere to the House motion, and the House conferees, of course, finally yielded on that provision, because the House had to adhere.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let me ask the gentleman this: If that provision as it appears in the bill reported by the committee should become a law, then the clerk of the Member becomes a House employee. That is true, is it not, designated by the Member?

Mr. COX. Yes; technically true; but not her work.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Under the law as it now stands, there is allowed to the Member \$2,000 for clerical hire. He can expend all of that for one clerk or he can expend all of that for half a dozen clerks, if he desires so to do, perfectly legitimately. Now, if you change the law and provide that the clerk shall go upon the roll and that the check for \$2,000 per year shall be sent to that individual, then have you not prevented yourself from using any part of that \$2,000 to pay any except one individual?

Mr. COX. No; the language under this bill is wide enough to permit you or any other Member of the House to appoint one or more than one upon the rolls here. I do not care whether you put one on at \$1,200 and another one on at \$800; let them go on the roll and let them draw their own money.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes; I will yield for a question.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If the gentleman feels that way about it and puts his secretary on the roll, and if some other Member of the House can manage his better in some other way, what kick has the gentleman got? [Applause.]

Mr. COX. I have no kick at all, except to kick this question out of Congress and keep it out of here. It will come back to plague us forever unless we put these people on the roll. It will come up every year when the legislative bill comes in; and there is just one way to prevent that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KNUTSON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. COX. It will come home to roost on you.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I should like to know whether the gentleman from Indiana proposes to make the point of order?

Mr. COX. I can not announce that now. I want to propound a question to the House, as I said before, with a view to seeing whether or not there are any other amendments to be offered to this proposed amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. Has the point of order been disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. GOOD. Has a point of order been made?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. GOOD. Has it been withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not. The point of order has been reserved. That is the status of this amendment.

Mr. GOOD. Then I ask for the regular order.

Mr. COX. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOON. I reserve the point of order for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee make the point of order?

Mr. MOON. No; I just reserve it for a moment. I want to say that I have no objection to the legislation that is desired, to put these clerks upon the rolls. But we have an illustration here to-day of the trouble we get into when a committee of this House attempts to usurp the power and authority of another committee. Under the law and the rules of this House the Committee on Appropriations has no authority to legislate about anything. It makes appropriations. Yet it is placing legislation upon its bills right along. There was no necessity for placing this legislation upon this bill. The committee might have made the appropriation as authorized by law. Of course no objection could be made before the bill came into the House and was reported, except to the whole bill, and that could not be done. The report having been made, then the committee got jurisdiction to bring the question before the House for consideration, provided it did not conflict with that other rule which is now being applied, of legislation on an appropriation bill. It is the insidious way in which they attempt to get in here that I object to. What condition have they put this House in to-day? The only law on this subject for the payment of secretaries is for \$1,200 per annum. The increases have been carried in the annual appropriation bills. Now the amount is \$2,000 a year. Any amendment above \$1,200 is subject to the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman's statement as to the permanent law is not quite accurate.

Mr. MOON. Was it \$1,500 instead of \$1,200?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No; all the permanent law that I have been able to find upon the question is \$100 per month during a session of Congress to those Members who are not chairmen of committees having clerks, and to those who are chairmen of committees having clerks, \$100 a month during vacation.

Mr. MOON. I may be wrong as to the exact language of the law, but assuming that it is as my colleague says, it does not alter this situation one iota. Now what situation have they put us in in reference to this question? My colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], makes the point of order on the language following the appropriation of \$880,000.



The point of order is well taken, because of the fact that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill. Then my other colleague from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] makes the point of order on the appropriation of \$880,000, and that is well taken, because it is beyond the amount for which the committee could appropriate. In other words, the Committee on Appropriations comes into this House with new legislation that it ought not to have brought in, and then it comes in and of its own motion strikes from the bill the appropriation for the salaries of the clerks to the Members of the House and leaves the bill naked on that question.

Now, the amendment comes again from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. It is subject to a point of order. All these amendments are subject to points of order. You could not get anything into this bill now except the old salary under the old law if the point of order is insisted upon.

I mention these facts to show you the attitude that the House is put in by an attempt to usurp power that does not belong to the committee. The only thing that can be done legally, if this point is insisted upon, is to put back the old salary and then for the Judiciary Committee to bring into this House a bill that will authorize an increase of the salary to \$2,000. The Committee on Appropriations has no power to do it, and it ought not to interfere with these questions. I am not going to attempt to further embarrass the House by making parliamentary suggestions. I simply reserved the point of order, not for the purpose of embarrassing the House in this matter and reducing the salary of these clerks, but to show you how wrong it is and what an error we can get into in an attempt to override the rules of the House and usurp a jurisdiction that does not belong to us. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to reply to the gentleman from Tennessee in kind, but the gentleman is chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I say in all good feeling that his committee has violated the rules of this House repeatedly. As we all know, it has been necessary for him frequently to go to the Committee on Rules to make in order propositions that he carried in the Post Office appropriation bill. They were placed there in clear violation of the rules of the House, as much so as any action of the appropriation committee about which the gentleman complains. I cite this to show the inconsistency of some complaints which are being made.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I do not yield now. The facts are these: The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has correctly said that the law now on the statute books provides only \$100 a month for Members during the actual session, and \$100 in vacation for those who are chairman of committees. Now, if the committee had brought in that sort of a proposition, it would have been a great injustice to you gentlemen who are not chairman of committees, with \$5,000 for clerk hire by virtue of such chairmanship. This provision is primarily for the Member without a chairmanship, and not for the chairman of a big committee, who not only has possibly \$5,000 for clerical help by reason of such chairmanship but also the help provided for each Member.

Long before I came to Congress the legislative appropriation bill carried a provision giving to clerks of the House a sum in excess of that provided by law. The Committee on Appropriations in this particular instance has done no more than Appropriation Committees have done for the last 20 years or more. The gentleman, my colleague, for whom I have great regard and great personal admiration, has been a Member of the House for 22 years, and yet this is the first time he ever rose on the floor of the House to criticize the Appropriation Committee because it has brought in a provision giving Members of the House adequate clerical service to enable them to perform their duties.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Why not equalize it by taking away some of the money from the chairmen of the great committees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not think that would meet with favor from them.

Mr. BUTLER. I belong to a party that is very unfortunate. [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct in that; but so far as clerical assistance is concerned he is no more unfortunate than I am.

Mr. BUTLER. But I do not want you to reduce it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I did not desire to arouse bad temper in my friend from Nashville, nor did I rise for the purpose of making a statement that would in any way interfere with the salary given Members' clerks. His suggestion that a chairman of a committee could well afford, because he has other clerks, to let this go out on a point of order is not in

accordance with the fact, because there is no desire on the part of any chairman of a committee that I know of to prevent the membership of this House from having \$2,000 for their clerical assistance. I was just showing the attitude in which the gentleman can put the House and regretting that he did such a thing. With all kindness toward my good friend from Tennessee, he has put us in the attitude so that any man on the floor of the House, if he sees fit to do it, can object to these amendments and force this whole question to the Judiciary Committee for legislation in order for you to get over \$1,200 a year for your clerks. I have not proposed to do it. I have said that I would not do it, because I did not want a thing of that sort done, and yet he gets up here and assumes that I have said that my purpose and intention was to do that, because I have some other clerical assistance.

Well, as far as I am concerned, I suppose our committee does about as much work as any of them, and I do about as much as any clerk. I do not want to put the House in an embarrassing situation at all. I wanted to emphasize the fact that this is an usurpation of power and authority which has to stop and is going to stop as far as I can help to stop it. If it was not for further embarrassing the House and doing an injustice, I would like to insist on the point of order and show the gentleman how necessary and how essential it is for committees to follow the law in this country instead of attempting to violate it by encroachment on the jurisdiction of other committees. The gentleman says that I have made no point of order against provisions heretofore. I have always made it a point in this House to look after the business of the committee that I had charge of and the work on that committee, if I could. I have not undertaken to interfere with other committees and do not propose to do it until they begin to encroach upon the committee that I am interested in. Then I am going to sustain the jurisdiction and dignity of that committee, if I can, and the gentleman will find before the consideration of this bill closes that it contains some other items that are going to be stricken out because of the assumption of jurisdiction that is not warranted. The Committee on Appropriations has to keep within its own boundaries, and if it goes into those of others it has to be driven out.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair indulge me by unanimous consent for just a word or two on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no point of order pending. The reservation of a point of order was withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Ever since I have been a Member of this House there has rarely been an appropriation bill, before the bills were divided or since they were divided, that has not had in it one or more and sometimes 15 or 20 propositions not provided for by permanent law. Every such proposition is subject to a point of order, and any one of the 435 Members can make the point of order. So, after all, I apprehend that with members of these respective appropriating committees it is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. If these outrages are committed it is within the power of any Member to trim the bill. It is said that it is responsible for all this hurrah about clerk hire. I think I understand why the hurrah. The law is \$1,200 for each fiscal year during the session. There you are. That is legal. If this whole thing goes out on a point of order some one can offer the amendment for \$1,200, and it will not be subject to a point of order, but there is not a man in the House now who does not understand that, and we have the language, because there is no Member that wants to cut down below \$2,000; and there you are.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to perfect, and I submit that that takes preference.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] can offer an amendment to perfect the pending amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I offer as an amendment the following proviso, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee offers an amendment to the amendment of Mr. STAFFORD by adding at the end thereof the following proviso:

Provided, further, That said amount of \$2,000 shall be the annual allowance for clerk hire for each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner hereafter, to be paid under the limitations and upon the conditions herein prescribed.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the provision that makes it permanent law.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, it is not subject to the point of order, and I suggest that it be disposed of.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, the whole question, it seems to me, has been brought about by an attempt upon the part of the House to be economical. If this body would appropriate a suffi-

cient amount of money to permit each Member to transact his business in an orderly way and with dispatch, there would be no question then but what we could put upon the rolls every one of the employees of such Members. The membership of this House is composed of men who are comparatively poor. A great many of the Members of this House can not afford to go into their pockets, as they are compelled to do every year, and hire clerks to transact the Government business. Let me call attention to what we have done already, without any objection at all. We have given to the other body an allowance for clerk hire. Take the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and I take it there is no more inactive committee in Congress than that.

Mr. MADDEN. That is in the Senate?

Mr. GOOD. That is in the Senate. On page 4 of the bill you will find that we appropriate for the chairman of that committee a clerk at \$2,220 a year, an assistant clerk at \$1,440 a year, a messenger at \$1,200 a year. The chairman of that committee has a force to do his work that costs the Government every year \$4,800. After we have taken care of all the Members of the Senate who are chairmen of committees—and there are 24 Senators who are not chairmen of committees—we incorporated this provision:

For assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, as follows: Twenty-four clerks, at \$2,000 each; 24 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each; 24 messengers, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$105,600.

That amounts to \$4,400 a year to every Member of that body who is not the chairman of a committee, so no Senator has less than \$4,400 a year for clerk hire. The House has attempted to be economical. It has attempted to enact legislation that would permit a Member who can not afford to pay out of his pocket for clerical services necessary to perform his work to employ more than one clerk out of the allowance. Each Member of the House can put on the roll in the Clerk's office the names of the persons to whom he pays this \$2,000, and he can pay it for such service just as he pleases during the year.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believe that the membership of this House is honest. I do not believe there is a man in the House who will take a single penny that is voted to him by Congress for clerk hire and use it for his own benefit. I have no objection to this amendment excepting this. I do not believe that now is the time, when our people are being taxed as they were never taxed before, to raise salaries, or to increase the expenses of the House or any department of the Government if it can be avoided. Adopt this resolution, and put on the rolls the secretary of the Member at \$2,000, and the membership of this House will rise, as it will have a right to rise and ought to rise, and demand that each Member have an additional clerk in order that Members of the House can perform their work.

Now, I do not believe we ought to do that now. I do believe that we ought, if possible, to economize a little longer along this line. Advocating economy in other Government departments, let us set the example. This is not the time to change the law in this respect, for it will result in increased appropriations, and therefore I am for the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I do.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Does the gentleman know of any time when a Member of Congress had more work to do and needed additional help any worse than he does at this time since this war has been in progress?

Mr. GOOD. No; I think that is true, and I think the consensus of opinion of the committee which has investigated this matter for years is that Members of Congress will get along by adding two and sometimes three employees as clerks and dividing up this \$2,000, and thereby in a way perform their duties.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I do.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there any other branch of this Congress the Members of which have more work for their clerks to do than the Members of this branch?

Mr. GOOD. No; no other branch has as much to do, of course.

Mr. LITTLE. Excuse me, but how much less is the clerk hire of a Member of this House under this law than the clerk hire of Members of some other body?

Mr. GOOD. Twenty-four hundred dollars or more.

Mr. KNUTSON. Twenty-four hundred dollars.

Mr. LITTLE. Just put that answer in the Record.

Mr. GOOD. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, does the Chair care to hear from me? I invoke the well-known rule of parliamentary practice in this House that where a proposition which

would as an original proposition be subject to a point of order is offered to an amendment or to a proposition which would have been subject to the point of order if made, that amendment or proposition is in order. The situation is this: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was subject to a point of order had that point of order been made, and the Chair would have sustained it, of course; but it not having been made, it having been admitted, then the amendment which I have offered, although as an original proposition it would have been subject to the point of order, is under the well-fixed rule in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard?

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Tennessee has correctly stated the status of this amendment, but the point which I desired to call to the Chair's attention was this: The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] had only reference to appropriations for this year. It did not attempt to enact permanent law that would control in the future appropriations under this item. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] offers an amendment, a part of which I concede is in order, but a part of which is not germane, in that it attempts to enact permanent law on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman means the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT?

Mr. GOOD. No; Mr. BYRNS. If I correctly heard the reading the amendment or the substitute offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] it provides that hereafter, and so forth.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That substitute has not been read, and it does not provide—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The amendment which I offered is to make it permanent law.

Mr. GOOD. This is the provision to which I desire to direct the attention of the Chair. It is that part which would enact this as a permanent law to which I object. I made no point of order on the other provision. It seems to me that portion is not germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The Chair will ask the indulgence of the committee for a few moments while he states the principles upon which his ruling will be based. These principles are often appealed to, and merit a very precise and definite statement in order that they may be clearly understood, and their application readily followed. If a paragraph contains any offending matter, and I mean by this any matter that is subject to a point of order, then the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order. It is competent, however, for a Member to direct his point of order to the offending matter alone, and if he thus restricts his objection, then the offending matter only, will be expunged. But if the point of order is directed to an entire paragraph, any portion of which is not in order, the point of order will be sustained as to the paragraph in its entirety. On the other hand a paragraph containing offending matter but not objected to on that account, remains in the bill as a whole, and within certain limitations, is open to amendment. The statement is often made that under the conditions last stated, the paragraph is open to amendments that would otherwise be out of order. But this is not a very precise statement of the rule since it is calculated to convey the erroneous idea that the door is wide open to amendments whatever their character, or the extent of their illegality. The true ruling and the one fully supported by the precedents is that a paragraph embodying legislation which is allowed to remain in an appropriation bill, may be perfected by a germane amendment, but this does not permit an amendment which adds additional legislation. Fourth Hinds, section 3836, ruling by Theodore Burton, Chairman. The Chairman, as a part of his ruling, made the following statement:

The Chair, though somewhat doubtful, thinks the best rule is: That if a paragraph has been included in a bill which has in it a taint of illegality, or of being contrary to existing law, that paragraph can be corrected or perfected by an amendment; but if the further paragraph which is proposed, as an amendment, carries a further degree of illegality, affecting the whole paragraph as amended, then it is not in order.

Manifestly this ruling is fundamentally sound. The existence of illegality in a paragraph should not furnish the groundwork, or afford the excuse, to engraft upon the paragraph additional and perhaps more sweeping illegalities in the form possibly of radical changes of existing law. The principle fundamental to the whole situation is that it is undesirable to enact essential legislation in an appropriation bill. The distinction made by the Chairman in the decision cited, is clearly in the interest of good legislation, and wholesome procedure. It is one that was not only proper to be made upon the facts in that case, but one



that ought to be followed, since otherwise, if some nonessential, but offending matter, should be allowed to remain in a paragraph, amendments of the most sweeping character, embodying new and additional illegalities might be construed to be in order, upon the theory that the presence of the offending matter in the paragraph under consideration, removed the right to object to new illegalities. Further rulings sustaining the position of Chairman Burton will be found in Fourth Hinds, section 3823, section 3826, section 3832, section 3838.

The conclusion of this matter then is that:

In an appropriation bill a paragraph embodying legislation and allowed to remain in the bill may be perfected by a germane amendment,

that is, an amendment germane to this otherwise illegal matter, but this does not permit an amendment which adds additional legislation which is not a development, or perfecting of the original offending matter.

The amendment which the gentleman from Tennessee submits, proposes to add a new feature of permanent law to the proposition now under consideration. If there is illegal matter in the pending proposition, to what extent can the matter proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee, be considered a development, or perfecting of that matter? It is an enlargement of the illegal content of the proposition before the committee, in the way of new and permanent legislation. The Chair does not consider that this amendment fairly comes within the principle announced with respect to perfecting offending matter allowed to remain in an appropriation bill, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CALDWELL to the Stafford amendment: After the word "appropriation" in the Stafford amendment, and before the word "Provided," insert, "And in addition thereto each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, who shall certify that additional help is necessary in the discharge of his official duties, one clerk, who shall be a stenographer, \$100 per month during the session of Congress, to pay which so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Two gentleman reserve the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Clerk to read the amendment as it will read if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be read again for the information of the committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I mean the entire amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 23, on page 19, insert: "Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation. And in addition thereto each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner who shall certify that additional help is necessary in the discharge of his official duties, one clerk, who shall be a stenographer, \$100 per month during the session of Congress, to pay which so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House and be subject to be removed at the will of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are appointed; and any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may appoint one or more clerks, who shall be placed on the roll as the clerk of such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointments."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I make this point: This amendment is practically a statement of the law as it now stands, and if offered alone, without the Stafford amendment, would be in order. In addition to that, it is germane to the Stafford amendment, because it extends and perfects the proposition as submitted to this House in the matter of employment of necessary help in the discharge of the official duties of the Members, Delegates, and Commissioners in this House. This proposition was submitted to this House in the Sixty-fourth Congress, second session, and the gentleman from Mississippi

[Mr. HARRISON] was in the chair. The matter was there passed upon and the Chair ruled that it was in order, and the House voted upon it. And under that precedent, and under the precedents already established and read by the Chair here to-day, and in view of the fact that this is a germane amendment, is a repetition of the law as it now stands, and was ruled to be in order in connection with the identical amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] in the Sixty-fourth Congress. I submit this is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not restate the principles previously announced.

The Chair has been cited to the decision of Mr. Chairman HARRISON, and has examined it carefully, and also the other decisions on the principle involved. Mr. Chairman HARRISON seemed to consider that the amendment was in order on the general ground that the paragraph contained illegal matter, and therefore other illegal matter could be submitted by way of amendment. There was no precise statement of the principle, or citation of precedents. I have tried to point out the limitations which surround the admission of illegal matter to a paragraph already tainted with illegality.

The amendment provides an additional allowance for clerk hire for Members, and provides further that this additional allowance shall be expended for a stenographer. Looking to the proposition proposed to be amended, what is the illegal matter in that proposition which this amendment will develop, and perfect, and to which it may be fairly considered germane?

It would be difficult I think, to indicate this matter. The amendment is illegal in more than one respect. The paragraph, or amendment to which this amendment is offered, contains illegal matter, in that the amount allowed by basic law is increased from \$1,200 to \$2,000. Can it be fairly construed that an amendment which increases further that allowance, and provides in addition that this increase shall be expended upon a stenographer, merely perfects the illegal increase in the original allowance, without adding a new element of illegality, namely that the Members will be compelled to apply this increase to the employment of a stenographer? The amendment reduces the discretion of the Members in the application of the money appropriated for clerk hire. It directs their discretion, and requires it to be exercised in an accurately prescribed fashion.

It would be perfectly appropriate and in order to increase by amendment the amount of \$2,000, and make it \$3,000, if the committee chooses to do so, or \$4,000, or any other amount that may be desired. Such amendments would be germane developments of the illegal matter. Should this be done, the Members could utilize the increase over the original allowance for the employment of a stenographer, since there is no limitation in the basic law upon the use of the money appropriated for clerk hire.

A Member may expend his allowance upon one, two, three or four clerks; they may be all stenographers; they may be clerks who are not stenographers; they may be typists; they may be both stenographers and typists. These details are left to the discretion of the Member when selecting his clerks. But this amendment takes away this discretion in the use of the increase proposed. It prescribes that the increased amount to be appropriated for clerk hire shall be expended upon the employment of a stenographer, and for no other purpose. Existing law leaves to the Members the free exercise of discretion in the application of the funds to be expended to secure clerical assistance. The amendment proposes new law. It creates an additional fund for clerk hire, a fund that can be expended in but one direction, namely the employment of a stenographer. This will be legislation on an appropriation bill, and new illegality. It is not a perfecting amendment to existing illegality, that is to say to what would be existing illegality if the increased appropriation for clerk hire had not been allowed to remain in the amendment without objection. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEEKER. If an amendment had been offered to change the sum from \$2,000 to \$3,200, would that be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. According to the precedents, certainly.

Mr. MEEKER. I move that the Stafford amendment be amended to read "\$3,200" instead of "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to amend the Stafford amendment by striking out the sum "\$2,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the sum "\$3,200." The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MEEKER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 63.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. If this addition should be adopted it becomes a part of the other amendment and would be reported to the House; and when reported to the House it would be subject to a yea-and-nay vote, as I understand it, and then how many of us will vote "yea"? If the vote is "nay" it cuts out everything.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. MEEKER to act as tellers.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the process of voting. Those in favor of the amendment will pass through the tellers and be counted.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 60, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee offers the following substitute for the Stafford amendment:

"Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: For clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, necessary in the discharge of their official and representative duties, \$2,000 each per annum, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners from and after July 1, 1918, shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House of Representatives and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid: *Provided further*, That each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner may appoint for such periods and at such rates of compensation as he shall determine within the said sum of \$2,000 a clerk or clerks who shall be subject to be removed at the will of the person by whom they are appointed: *Provided further*, That any accrued amounts remaining unexpended at any time during the fiscal year shall accumulate and be available for expenditure at any time during the remainder of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled, from the date of commencement of their respective terms, to make appointments and removals of clerks under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the employment of any clerk or clerks hereunder shall cease upon the death, resignation, removal, or termination of service of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they were appointed."

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I make the point of order that the substitute is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Several gentlemen make a point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I direct the attention of the Chair to the language of the first proviso—

*Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners from and after July 1, 1918, shall be placed on the roll of the employees of the House of Representatives and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid.

Now, I invoke the two rulings of the Chair, just made, in support of the point of order which I now offer, namely, that it is not in order to offer a proposition not germane when it would add to the illegality of the original proposition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And this proposition would radically change the existing law, in that it would change the method of payment to the clerk, and it would change the character of the clerk by designating him or her as an employee of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late; that this amendment has been considered, and that an amendment offered to it was voted down and disposed of therefore it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. This substitute was not offered to the House before, and as soon as it was offered the gentleman from Tennessee made a point of order to it.

Mr. WALSH. Is not this the substitute that was read to the House some little time ago?

The CHAIRMAN. For the purpose of information.

Mr. WALSH. Only for information?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I concede the fact that, in view of the ruling of the Chair, the amendment as read at the Clerk's desk is subject to a point of order, because under the terms of the amendment it would have the effect of making it permanent law. That was intended, because I believe we ought to have a permanent law on the subject if we can place these clerks on the roll. But in view of the point that has been made, if it is insisted on and in order to make the amendment, in my judgment, clearly in order, I want to ask unanimous consent that the words "from and after July 1, 1918," be stricken from the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I object to any modification in the way of amendment if there is any point of order pending. I am going to make the point of order on this myself, if nobody else does.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects. If the Chair is right in the ruling heretofore, this substitute amendment is clearly out of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I offer an amendment with the date "July 1, 1918," stricken out. I do not see that there is any necessity of reading it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "from and after July 1, 1918."

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment reported as it would read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as it would read with the correction made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to have the amendment reported as it would read if it were added to the Stafford amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a substitute amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It has to be reported if anyone demands it. It is a new proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserved a point of order on the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee to the Stafford amendment:

"Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: For clerk hire for Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, necessary in the discharge of their official and representative duties, \$2,000 each per annum, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House of Representatives and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid: *Provided further*, That each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner may appoint for such periods and at such rates of compensation as he shall determine within the said sum of \$2,000 a clerk or clerks who shall be subject to be removed at the will of the person by whom they are appointed: *Provided further*, That any accrued amount remaining unexpended at any time during the fiscal year shall accumulate and be available for expenditure at any time during the remainder of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be entitled, from the date of commencement of their respective terms, to make appointments and removals of clerks under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the employment of any clerk or clerks hereunder shall cease upon the death, resignation, removal, or termination of service of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they were appointed."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the substitute is not in order; and I again direct the attention of the Chair to the language of the first proviso, which I quoted a few moments ago in making the point of order to the amendment as originally offered by the gentleman from Tennessee; that is, that it vitally changes the present law and therefore is not germane to the amendment, in that it changes the character of the clerk by making him or her an employee of the House instead of the employee of the Member, and that it changes the plan of payment by directing that the check be paid to the clerk instead of through the Member as heretofore.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment is germane to the amendment now pending. As I understand, that is the only question before the Chair.

The amendment does not make the clerk an employee of the House. The gentleman from Tennessee is mistaken about that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know whether it changes it or not, but it says that it does. It provides that the clerk "shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The only thing it does is to change the method of payment. It says he shall be paid "in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid."



Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman what the word "other" means.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It reads "other employees of the House." The gentleman is right about that, but I submit that if this amendment is read from beginning to end it does not make the clerk an employee of the House, for it gives to the Member full and complete authority to appoint him, to discharge him, to give him any sum that he may please for any period of time that he employs him, and that being so he can not possibly be construed to be an employee of the House.

The only point I want to make is that this amendment is germane to the amendment pending, because it only seeks to change the method in which the clerk shall be paid. In one amendment it is provided that the amount appropriated for Members' clerks shall be paid to the Members themselves, whereas in the amendment which I have offered it provides that they shall be paid through the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It makes no change in the law. It makes no change in the number of clerks who may be employed.

Mr. MEEKER. Then why use the words "other employees," if this does not make the clerk an employee of the House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it that is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the existing law the clerks whom we employ are not employees of the House of Representatives and therefore they are subject to military duty. Under the phraseology of the substitute of the gentleman, would they not be employees of the House and relieved from military duty, so that a Member might employ a number of clerks and thereby exempt them from military duty because they are employees of the House, and as employees of the Congress they would, under the draft act, be relieved from military duty?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. By no means. I do not think this amendment can be construed as making these clerks employees of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the language of the amendment, in order to get the precise facts before the House. The amendment contains this provision:

*Provided, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House of Representatives, and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid.*

The Chair is advised by the Clerk that that is the portion of the amendment to which the point of order is directed. It seems to the Chair that this language makes a very definite change in existing law. The basic law does not impose any requirement of this character in regard to the clerks of the Members, or require that they shall be paid as other employees of the House are paid. It is true that this change in existing law is for the duration only of this act, but the principle involved is the same. The Chair does not think that so large an increase of illegality as this amendment proposes, can be fairly said to be a perfecting amendment to the increase in the amount allowed by the basic law for clerk hire. If it could be fairly so construed, then this amendment would be in order.

The Chair is of opinion that this, like the other amendment, is controlled by the principle heretofore announced, and is not in order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But, as I understand, the Chair does not base his ruling on the fact that the word "other" is used in the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not entirely.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the Stafford amendment by striking out the words "two thousand" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "twenty-four hundred." At present Members are getting \$166.66 per month for clerk hire. I think the amount should be \$200 a month. After the amendment has been reported, then I would like to speak upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CALDWELL moves to amend the Stafford amendment by striking out the figures "\$2,000," in the fourth line, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,400."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would this remedy the difficulty the gentleman has in mind? The trouble is that when you fix the amount at \$2,000 the clerk expects to get that amount. If you increase the amount to \$2,400, the clerk will

expect to get that. That bars the Member from employing additional help unless he pays for it out of his own pocket.

Mr. CALDWELL. In a great many instances that is true, but the trouble is that the chairmen of all of these committees, who have plenty of help, refuse to permit the other Members of the House to have the amount of help that they are entitled to, unless we write this bill in such a way as to meet with their approval. Now, personally I desire that enough money should be appropriated to enable us to pay for the necessary help to discharge our official duties.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman wants to get one or more clerks?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is what I want, and I presume most Members do.

Mr. CALDWELL. If this amendment is adopted, instead of "clerk hire" why not say "two clerks," so that a Member will have to divide it?

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it ought to be thoroughly understood in what the gentleman is going to say that he intends the \$2,400 shall be used to pay for such number of clerks as a Member may think proper to employ.

Mr. CALDWELL. Absolutely.

Mr. MADDEN. So that the secretary or the clerk of the Member will not feel that it is his as a matter of right and that the Member has no rights.

Mr. CALDWELL. I think the amendment should be further amended to provide for two clerks.

Mr. MADDEN. To employ all that a Member likes to employ.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Would the gentleman object to having the names of the clerks on the roll?

Mr. CALDWELL. No.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. COX. Would it not obviate the objection if the gentleman's amendment should carry, to put in a proviso providing that this shall not apply to chairmen of committees who have annual or session clerks?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, in the Sixty-fourth Congress I attempted to get additional help for Members who are not chairmen of committees. At that time I was paying out of my own pocket a sufficient sum of money to be considered as an item in my annual expenses. I found when I started this agitation that there were a great many Members of Congress who did not have chairmanships in exactly the position that I was in. I find that many men who voted against the proposition in the Sixty-fourth Congress, and are still here, admit that they made a mistake in not giving additional help to Members. Now, it happens that in this session of Congress we are in a war, and we have here in the course of the operation of that war a great deal of military legislation requiring the attention of Members of Congress. We are the only representatives of the families left at home who have boys gone away to the trenches and who need the assistance that the Government of the United States is prepared to give to those families left here dependent upon us. [Applause.]

Every day my mail is filled with complaints of mothers and sisters and of the children of the men that we sent away to France to defend our country that they are not receiving the appropriation that we have made for the support of these families. It is necessary for me to conduct a great deal more correspondence than I did before, and I know that I am not unique in that position, but that every other Member of the House is under the same obligation. I want to say that I have the courage and conviction to vote for the necessary appropriation to enable me to discharge my duties for which I was elected, and I hope that there are enough other Members in the House to back me up. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to detain the House on this amendment, but I express the earnest hope that the House will not adopt it. Here is a proposition, Mr. Chairman, that adds to the pay roll \$176,000. I want to appeal to the Members of this House at this time, when we are heavily taxing the people in order to meet the enormous expenditure of this great war in which we are engaged, when no man can tell how much more taxes we will have to levy upon them before we bring this war to a successful conclusion—I say I want to appeal to the Members of this House not to increase the burden of the people by adding \$176,000 to their present burdens for our own benefit in the way of payment to our clerks.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. How much additional work has the gentleman had this year over last year? I will answer that myself by saying that I have had very little.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have had some additional work growing out of the war.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not a fact that every year there is debate in this House as to the appropriation for clerk hire? Why should it not be written down who the clerks are?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I submit in all fairness that we can not afford to increase the clerk hire up to \$2,400, especially since a year ago we raised it from \$1,500 to \$2,000. We ought not to do it in the interest of the taxpayers of this country, who are now overburdened, although they are willing to bear the burden and will bear others in order to win the war. I appeal to you to vote the amendment down.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If this amendment is voted into the bill, when the bill gets into the House and a separate vote is demanded on the amendment, will the vote come on the amendment as a whole, and if the amendment is then voted down there will be no appropriation for clerk hire?

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Gentlemen of the committee, I offered a little while ago an amendment to make this \$3,200, and I did it in good faith. I do not know what may be the obligations of other Members of the House. I think that it is just as well to be frank in regard to the expenses as to anything else. Since this war has been declared my office force has cost \$325 a month. They work all the time, and there is no man who has a district that is a live district, if he is a live man, who can divide \$2,000 among his clerks and look them squarely in the face when he does it.

We put anybody into the civil service at \$75 a month, and ask people to work in our office for \$50 and \$60, and then we talk about good wages. Now, some gentlemen in this House are financially able not only to pay for all help in the office but to hand back their salary checks; but, thank God, there are not very many of that kind. [Applause.] There are some other Members in the House who are running for office in the district because of the cheap way in which they get along when they are here; but, thank God, there are not many of those. People in this country want service.

They want efficiency. The Senators now get on an average of \$5,500 a year for clerk hire—almost \$6,000. Everywhere else in all appropriations this year we have been giving money by the billions, for all of the departments, without a moment's hesitation; yet when it comes to the man who does the work, the man who stands between the people and the Government, the man who acts as the go-between for both, in all of the departments, we get up here and camouflage for two hours about a hundred dollars a month more in war time with which to serve the people. I venture to say there is not an efficient Congressman in this House who is within \$1,000 of what he gets from his appropriation for this work now; that he is paying anywhere from \$100 to \$200 a month out of his own pocket. Some gentleman awhile ago wanted to know who would vote yea on the \$3,200 proposition. I will do it, quickly. [Applause.] It is only honest, and when we stalk around talking to our people we can do one of three things: We can either neglect our work, or keep our office force at so low a pay that we are ashamed to tell how many we have and what we pay, or pay for them out of our own pockets. I do not think the people of this country expect or want that a man shall come here and do all the work that needs to be done and at the same time bear such a heavy portion of the burden financially; and it is only practical common sense that we should see to it that the office force should be kept up. You have got to do one of two things: If you attend to your departmental work yourself, you neglect the work on the floor of the House as a legislator; if you attend to the work here as a legislator, somebody has got to look after that departmental work.

The danger to the American Congress to-day is that the membership shall become mere departmental flunkies for their district and forget the legislative end of it, the thing for which they were sent. We should have \$5,000 a year to run our offices. We should be able to put men in those offices who are recognized as competent, efficient departmental men, who could give all of their time to the work of the details of all matters for the people back home, and the men on this floor should be given and should take more time to go over the legislative matters that are coming before us. The chairman of the committee appealed to us not to vote this \$400 extra. All it would amount to

would be \$200 a month total. I have over 500,000 people in my district. Mail comes into my office at the rate of from 100 to 250 letters and telegrams a day since we have declared war. I can either throw all of that in the wastebasket or go out and pay for the extra help to attend it. There is nothing about this thing in any way but just an attempt so that a man can go back to his district and say that while he voted billions for everything else he kept his office down to a cheap line all of the time. [Applause.]

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I have been on the Committee on Appropriations for several years. It is most difficult to understand the demands made upon the Public Treasury until you are brought face to face with the conditions every day as are the members of the Appropriations Committee. The present salary of Members' secretaries is ample. It was increased last year from \$1,500 to \$2,000 by the House over the protest of the Committee on Appropriations. Now, we see some Members voting to increase their clerk hire to \$3,200. This was voted down a moment ago by a small majority. Now comes a proposition to increase the salary from \$2,000 to \$2,400. This can not be defended anywhere or at any time upon any ground of reason or fairness. These places were created to enable Members of Congress to attend to their official duties by being relieved of a great deal of office work. These places were not intended to be used to assist Members in their campaigns. Those Members who think that your campaign funds should be furnished by the Government should have voted for the \$3,200 and should now vote for this \$400 increase. My own opinion is that when a Congressman confines his clerical business to the business of his office, there is not a Congressman here who can not have all this character of legitimate business attended to, but if he expects to conduct a political campaign at the expense of the Government, and is a constant campaigner of his district and is a constant searcher out in the departments for something he may send out to make a vote, and if the Public Treasury shall respond to keep him in Congress, then say so by voting to increase the private employment of the Members of Congress to an unlimited extent.

Mr. BLAND and Mr. CALDWELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I have only five minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will get the gentleman some more time.

Mr. Sisson. Very well; I will yield if the gentleman will get me more time.

Mr. CALDWELL. I want to say to the gentleman that if he means that as a reflection upon me, I would like to know it right here.

Mr. Sisson. I have not intended any reflection upon anyone. I have only stated my own position and my own views on this question, and in so doing only assume responsibility for my own vote. I have simply stated the fact to be that if a man gets \$2,000 for clerk hire and that clerk devotes all of his time and attention to the business of the Member as a Congressman, of a legitimate nature, not connected with matters which may help to reelect him, as a part of his campaign, that the American people are responding liberally, and I am trying to be honest at least with myself and say that my clerk is able to do that work and that his present compensation is ample.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Sisson. One moment. Not only that, but I want to say that if you had a dozen clerks, you gentlemen who want to do departmental work effectively would have to make frequent visits to the bureau chiefs and the departments to get your work done and be honest with yourself. For many things can better be done by the Congressman than by a clerk.

Several Members rose.

Mr. KEARNS. How many voters has the gentleman in his district?

Mr. Sisson. About 30,000 registered voters. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to all of these gentlemen who are clamoring to interrupt me. I did not know that so many Members were so touchy.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The gentleman will discontinue until order is restored.

Mr. Sisson. I decline to yield at present.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sisson. I decline to yield at present. I had no idea that when I made that statement that it would touch so many people personally or that it would touch so many people who themselves have greedy eyes upon the Treasury. [Applause.] I had no idea that men's consciences were that tender about this matter which affects themselves and their own private offices, and when I made the statement a moment ago that I believe that a Member of Congress who retains to himself that proper amount of intellectual integrity so that he could confine his clerk



hire, which last year was increased from \$1,500 to \$2,000, to the services that the clerk renders of that nature which devolves upon him only, as a Congressman and not to help in his campaign [applause] that it would create such a storm among so many Members. Think more of the taxpayer and less of your own interest, and you will be better Congressmen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISSON. I would ask for five more minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I object unless the gentleman yields to me.

Mr. SISSON. I will yield as much as I can, but I can not yield to 25 or 30 at a time when I only have five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. I only want the gentleman to yield to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, regular order!

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded, and the regular order is. Does anybody object to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I submit a request for unanimous consent? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments be closed in 20 minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the amendment and all amendments thereto terminate at the expiration of 20 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; I promised to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LITTLE. I notice the suggestion that everything above \$2,000 would be used practically for political purposes. I find that there is another body of people in this building who receive an average of \$5,562 for clerk hire. What I wanted to ask was, Does the gentleman think the excess they draw above what we draw is used for political purposes?

Mr. SISSON. Well, in some instances it may be so used. I do not know; but a Senator from one of the States has just as many times more voting population to care for as there are congressional districts in the State than the Member from the district in this House, and—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would suggest that a Member of this body should not discuss the Members of another body.

Mr. SISSON. I do not think the gentleman from Kansas had infringed upon that rule because he did not mention the other body; but, as a matter of fact, two wrongs do not make a right. What I am endeavoring to leave with each man and each man's conscience is this, that in voting the people's money for your clerk hire do you say on your conscience that if you were to restrict your clerk to those proper duties which devolve upon you as a Congressman and not to do your campaign work, would you need the extra clerk hire?

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISSON. Let me finish this sentence.

Mr. MEEKER. Is it not true that the total vote of the gentleman was 4,684 votes?

Mr. SISSON. In the general election; but we have no opposition after the nominations. [Laughter.] I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BLAND. I was going to ask about the same question.

Mr. DYER. How many white people and how many negroes are there in the gentleman's district?

Mr. SISSON. It is about equally divided between the whites and negroes.

I can not yield to all, and decline to yield further. I do not intend to permit the statements that have been made here to go unchallenged, that if the \$2,000 is used for legitimate purposes, and, by the way, I do not say you do anything illegitimate in the sense that you violate the law; I mean if you will consult your intellectual integrity and act on your oath as officers of this House you do need that much. I doubt extremely whether many of you would answer in the affirmative and say, "Yes; I need more and want the taxpayers to pay more."

Mr. MEEKER and Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I can not yield to all. Too many of you seem to be hit.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I realize fully—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I started to say I realize the difficulty in keeping many people out of the Federal Treasury, but I did not know that you would ever find such a grand rush upon the Treasury here from Members of Congress to get funds for their own use, because you and you only, together with the other body, are the sole guardians of the Treasury of the United States. Now, if you have made up your minds that notwithstanding the fact while this Government is being taxed white for war purposes and is called upon to respond in every line to the ever increasing demands made upon Congress, until the burdens are intolerable, that you will for your own offices demand this increase, you have the power to do it now. But mark you this, the day of reckoning will come, and may come soon, when the outraged people will right the wrong. Vote down this amendment. I ask you Members on the Republican side to join us on our side and vote this amendment down. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments close at the end of five minutes.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me state the unanimous-consent request first.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I move that all debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not move that now, because the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has been recognized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will permit me to do it.

Mr. CANNON. If I can have the five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the extent of the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph will terminate at the expiration of five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the motion just made. I move to insert the word "fifteen" in place of "five," and ask that five minutes be given to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee accept the amendment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How does the gentleman from Minnesota move to amend the motion?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. By adding the words "fifteen minutes."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] to the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this amendment is to increase the amount of clerk hire from \$2,000 to \$2,400.

Now, just let me call your attention to a little ancient history. In my first Congress, the Forty-third, the salary was \$7,500, having been increased from \$5,000 by the Forty-second Congress by a great majority just on the eve then of hard times. "Hell was to pay and no pitch hot." [Laughter.] Men that voted for that increase turned it back into the Treasury and were ridiculed, and that increase had more to do with giving you wicked Democrats three-fourths of the House than almost any other matter. People were out of humor, their taxes were high, and all that sort of thing.

Now, this war is on us and we have to win it no matter how long or short it may be. [Applause.] That is number one. Number two: We spoiled an hour or two this morning on \$100

increase to a laborer. Number three: As the money decreases in value, and as everything else, as measured in dollars, goes up, it is wonderful how much we have got to increase wages where we ought to increase them, to Government employees, and all this, that, and the other. Our salary is \$7,500, with clerk hire of \$2,000. This is a proposition to increase the clerk hire by \$400. I do not care whether I continue longer in public service or not—and this is from a personal standpoint—but as I look into your faces I think you all, on both sides of the House, want to bring your experience into the next Congress. How many of you are to have opponents I do not know, but if you increase the clerk hire \$400 that will let the demagogue in. It lets the man in who is now outside, and if I was a strong partisan just at this time, and if I could get all the Democratic side of the House to vote for it, and all my side of the House to vote against it, we would knock you out.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I will.

Mr. CALDWELL. I ask the gentleman to yield in order to say that if any demagogue in my district could beat me over an appropriation of \$400 to assist us in our duties here, I hope he would be able to do it.

Mr. CANNON. I have only five minutes. Let me say that the gentleman may have a fortunate constituency. It is a bad time for us, with our \$7,500 and \$2,000 for clerk hire, with all the appeals that are made to us for legislation, to increase salaries, and make all kinds of expenditure. It is a bad time from every standpoint to increase our pay one cent. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the original amendment has not been adopted. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For packing boxes, \$4,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: Page 21, strike out lines 13 and 14.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make any speech on this amendment. I desire to state the effect of it. It is to strike out the appropriation for oak and cedar boxes that are ordinarily distributed to Members of Congress during the session. I do not wish to make any speech on it, but I do think that it is an item that might well be dispensed with. Therefore I move to strike it out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will state that a similar provision to this was passed without objection for the Senate. This is for the benefit of the individual membership, and every Member will vote whether or not he has official need of these boxes. I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. COX. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 7, yeas 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Congressional Reference Library: Custodian, \$1,500; assistants—1 \$1,200, 1 \$960, 1 \$840; 2 junior messengers, at \$420 each; in all, \$5,340.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FESS: Page 24, line 12, after the figures "\$1,500" insert "and \$500 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to have close attention, if I can ask for such a thing in this House, to a few observations that I want to make very briefly.

This amendment is intended to add to the compensation of the present incumbent, the custodian of the Representatives' reading room over here in the Congressional Library, the sum of \$500 so long as he holds the position. It is intended to add \$500 to his annual salary, beginning this year.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Just in a moment. While I was in Ohio, before I became a Member of this body, I was considerably interested in library work, and my interest was stimulated in this custodian

of the Representatives' reading room through one of Ohio's men most interested in library work.

The man who holds this position, Mr. Lawrence Washington, is the only living man to-day born in Mount Vernon. He was born in the room in which the general died. He is the great-grandson of John Augustine Washington, the brother of Gen. Washington, the Father of his Country, and thereby he makes a connection with the Government back to the founder of this Republic.

He has been in the Library for over 20 years. Some 20 years ago he collected and sorted out the British parliamentary papers, which have been bound and now form 900 volumes, a very valuable piece of work, especially valuable to anyone interested in political or parliamentary history, as it makes a treasury of original information. He also made a careful notation of all the missing documents in the set of United States documents, a mammoth work for anyone to undertake and a most valuable contribution for our convenience, because when undertaking to find how many volumes there were in that set—I suppose there are at least 10,000 volumes in it—one is simply amazed at the stupendous task carried out by this man who has gone through all of them and has pointed out the missing documents and, where it was possible, ascertained where they could be found, if they are available.

I say nothing about his very courteous attitude toward the public or his very scholarly attainments. I do not think it is worth while for me to say that, because his position would warrant our expectation of that character. But, speaking of him personally, I may say he has eight sons, five of whom have entered or will enter the war, and four daughters, a family that he has brought up and educated, which, to say nothing of such contribution to his country, proves the burdens undertaken by a citizen who to-day gets only \$1,500 a year. I do not want to ask that the salary of that position be raised permanently, although I am sure it ought to be done, if salary is measured by standard of service, but so long as this man is holding that place he ought to be given an additional amount of money. I at first thought it ought to be \$1,000 additional, making the salary \$2,500. Some may think that figure is out of order. But it is not out of order. A man who can do the work he has done and is doing on behalf of Members of this body, and whose past service has saved to the Government the amount of money he has saved, because it would have cost the Government if it had been compelled to expend money to have this work done by experts, deserves this additional compensation. But aside from the amount of money saved, and aside from mere sentiment, and aside from his efficiency and cordiality and the valuable service he renders to this House, it seems to me he is worth an additional sum of money because of his devotion to the task he so cordially performs. It requires a familiar knowledge of books, a fairly good comprehension of subjects, and especially a facility to find what one is anxious to know. His service is valuable because to his knowledge is added an evident anxiety to render service. He must also be a man to deal with men of various temperaments. He has been especially valuable to Members who have occasion to look into documents and ascertain the sources of information. It is not important to know things but rather to know how to find what one does not know. This is the function of Mr. Washington.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CARLIN. I think the House would very quickly respond to the gentleman's wishes if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will not interpose a point of order. If the gentleman from Tennessee will let the House vote on it, I think we will all agree with you.

Mr. FESS. I agree with you that the House will not hesitate a minute if we can get over the difficulty of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Just one moment more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Speaking for myself, as one who frequently makes investigations on subjects that we have up for discussion, it is my custom to telephone over to the Representatives' reading room and call for Mr. Washington and tell him that I want to come over by a certain time this evening and look up some particular line of research. I tell him what I want, and say, "Will you please have the documents on the table, so that I will have access to them?" I go over there; there the books are, an abundance of them. Not only are the books there, but not infrequently the subject has been looked into and places marked, whereby with the expenditure of a very short time and the



expenditure of very little energy I can look through the books and ascertain the facts that I want. Now, you can not pay for that. That is cordiality, based upon ability, of course, which is valuable and rare, and it is a service that all of us ought not only to appreciate, but show our appreciation of; and in the interest of the man and his work, I hope that the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his point of order. I feel quite sure that those of you who have made frequent visits to the Library and know Mr. Washington must be as much surprised as I was to learn that the Government only paid him \$1,500 per year. If for no other reason, it would appear sufficient that a man who serves the membership of this House intellectually, as he must, would be rated differently, and especially when so efficient and when his name and birth link him with Mount Vernon and with the Father of his Country. I hope the point of order will be withdrawn and the House be given a chance to vote on the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I would not undertake to add anything to what the gentleman from Ohio has just said, but I do hope that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will not make his point of order.

I do not believe in all the departments of this Government a man can be found whose work is more efficient than Mr. Washington's, and I do not believe that an employee can be found the efficiency of whose work is as far out of proportion to the compensation that he receives from the Government. He not only does the things that Dr. Fess has referred to, but does them efficiently and effectively and intelligently. There are few Members who in the course of their service do not call upon Dr. Washington for help, and they never call in vain. The assistance that he renders by reason of the universality of his information is worth many, many times to the Government the money that we pay him in salary. Think of it! Think of a man of his qualifications, a man who does the valuable work that he does and renders the efficient service to the Government that this man renders, receiving only \$1,500 a year!

I am told he has been in that library 20 years. I know he was here when I came here 15 years ago. I have gone to him for assistance more than I have to any other one man in the Government, and I have never gone in vain. I have never asked him about any matter touching legislation here that he was not only willing and anxious to help me but also able to render most valuable assistance. Even if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] thinks it is a bad precedent to set in this bill, I hope the gentleman will realize the fact that this is certainly an exceptional case.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LONDON. What is his salary now?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Fifteen hundred dollars.

Mr. LONDON. And what is proposed in the amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Two thousand dollars.

Mr. LONDON. Five hundred dollars more?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. Is not \$1,500 rather small compensation for a man of the efficiency and ability that the gentleman has described?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I doubt if there is another man in the Government, certainly there are few as thoroughly equipped, who get so small a salary. No man will gainsay the fact that he is as thoroughly efficient and as thoroughly well equipped as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] has indicated. I hope very much that the gentleman from Tennessee will not insist on his point of order.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will allow me a couple of minutes, I wish to say that for the last 12 months I have had a good deal to do in the Library, in investigation and research, and I want to pay my tribute to Mr. Lawrence Washington, not only for his courtesy and politeness, but for his ability in intellectual pursuits, and I think we ought all to indorse heartily what has been said of him by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. I want to add my appeal also to the chairman of the committee that he will not raise the point of order against this.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Would it not be a distinct loss to the Members and to the Library if his services were in any way impaired or we were unable to avail ourselves of the splendid services of this gentleman?

Mr. HICKS. In answer to my friend from Michigan, I will say I think it would not only be our loss, but a loss to the entire country, because he is doing work there which is a benefit to all our constituents.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not question for a moment the high tributes that have been paid to Dr. Washington by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], the gentleman from Missis-

issippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS]. On the contrary, I am quite sure that all they have had to say concerning him is entirely true. In addition to that, there is a sentiment touching the name of Washington which appeals to every Member of this House. But the truth of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] is several hundred dollars more than the amount estimated for. The matter was considered in subcommittee, and the majority of the committee decided to leave this salary at the present figure. The general committee, of course, met and authorized the reporting of the bill. Frequently a Member has some very unpleasant duties to perform, but I feel that under the circumstances I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Just a moment. Will the gentleman allow the Committee of the Whole here to express its judgment on this matter? Let us vote on it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that he knows that in the consideration of this bill there are many similar requests made, and, to be perfectly frank with the gentleman, I do not feel that I am authorized to waive the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman remembers that we made an exception here in the matter of the salary of the Chaplain, and no point of order was raised, and the committee was permitted to vote on it. Now, that was a very exceptional case, and so is this. I hope the gentleman will not feel that his duty compels him to interpose this summary protest, by which the House will be denied the right to express its judgment.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. FIELDS. In view of the fact that the House seems almost unanimously in favor of this increase, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not think he could well afford to withhold his point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will look around I think he will see that there are not very many Members on the floor to express themselves one way or the other.

Mr. FIELDS. I think that if the attendance were larger the support to this amendment would increase equally.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated I feel constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for one moment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman said the amount named in the amendment was several hundred dollars higher than the estimate. What was the amount estimated?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The amount of the estimate was \$1,600.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Would the gentleman make any objection to \$1,600?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The same reasons would necessarily apply to that. As I stated, the committee considered this matter. It was not passed over lightly, and by a vote of the committee it was decided to let the salary stay at the present amount. Much as I have been moved by the very strong appeals made here on the floor, I do not feel that I have the authority to waive the point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman think that a man who will raise nine children, five of whom are in the service of the United States in the Army—

Mr. FESS. Twelve children, eight sons and four daughters.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Twelve children, and who has given five splendid men to the military service of the United States, and who has worked for the Government for 20 years on \$1,500 a year, ought to have a medal, the thanks of Congress, and a pension of at least \$500 a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think there is only one answer to that question.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GOOD. I think the gentleman from Tennessee has stated the matter fairly, that the committee did consider the question. It considered it, however, under the light that the committee had. As a member of the committee, I must confess that I have received some information that I did not have when the matter was before the committee; and I know that the gentleman from

Tennessee now is in possession of facts that he did not have when the committee considered the question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that when the matter was first taken up I was lacking in some information that I now have, but the gentleman remembers that before the subcommittee finally acted on this matter all that information was brought to us.

Mr. GOOD. I do not recall that the size of the family of Mr. Washington and the number of men that he will send from his own family to fight our battles was stated before the committee.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when this bill goes to the other body, when it goes to any deliberative body, and they consider these facts they will not hesitate to give this man a salary that ought to have been received by him for the last 10 years. [Applause.] When I found that this man was receiving a salary of only \$1,500 I was amazed. I did not know that he was the man that was performing the duties of custodian in that position. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. I hope he will let the House to-day perform what is a simple act of justice to this Government official and let the House take the responsibility. I do not believe that the gentleman from Tennessee wants to take it. I know how he feels about it. I know the gentleman is fair at all times and wants to be generous, and he wants to do what is right in regard to these things. I am sure he would not intentionally deprive this man of the salary that he thought he was justly entitled to, though the express letter of the law gave him a lower salary. I hope he will let the Members of this House determine this question, because it is a most meritorious one.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. RUCKER. There are a good many increases in this bill, are there not?

Mr. GOOD. There are some as much as \$500.

Mr. RUCKER. Some as much as \$1,000?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. If one-half that gentlemen have said here is true, and I presume it is all true, I should like to know what sort of a mountain of testimony was presented to the chairman to induce him to raise the salary of a bureau chief \$1,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman assumes that I am the whole committee, which is far from the truth. I am only one member of the committee.

Mr. RUCKER. I have always found that the gentleman had his own way about it in the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], who is a member of the subcommittee, I am sure knows the situation as I know it, and notwithstanding this, makes an appeal that I waive this point of order. I know and the gentleman from Iowa knows that it is my duty as a member of the committee toward the other members of the committee to stand by what that committee did. I feel reasonably sure that if the gentleman from Iowa were in my place in this particular instance, he would feel constrained, notwithstanding his own personal feelings in the matter, to make the point of order, and I therefore insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "\$1,500" and insert "\$1,600," on line 12, page 24.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 12, strike out "\$1,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,600."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, for the reason heretofore stated, I must make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distribution of card indexes: For service in connection with distribution of card indexes and other publications of the library: Chief of division, \$3,000; chief assistant, \$1,800; assistants—2 at \$1,600 each, 3 at \$1,500 each, 3 at \$1,400 each, 4 at \$1,200 each, 4 at \$1,100 each, 4 at \$1,000 each; for services of assistants at salaries less than \$1,000 per annum and for piecework and work by the hour, \$17,000, including not exceeding \$500 for freight charges, expressage, traveling expenses connected with such distribution, and expenses of attendance at meetings when incurred on the written authority and direction of the librarian, \$46,900.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like the attention of the chairman of the committee. I have been trying to find the paragraph under the title of Library of Congress, which contained a provision for printing of documents.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is carried in the sundry civil bill and is not carried in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I inquire of the gentleman if there is in this bill no provision of any character in reference to printing documents?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This does not carry any provision for the printing in the Library.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman's committee, the Committee on Appropriations, reports the sundry civil bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; but it is prepared by a different subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I understand; that may be; but may I be permitted to make this observation: Certain documents have been issued by the Library of Congress in recent years of extreme value from a historic point of view, and from the standpoint of information. Among others, I refer to the publication of the proceedings of the second Continental Congress which sat throughout the Revolutionary War. I notice that the publication of this document has been suspended; that is, no further publications have occurred in about three years. I took this up with the Librarian of Congress and he informed me that the reason was their appropriation for printing had either been cut down or found insufficient to do this and other work.

It seems to me that out of all the documents that the Government publishes these that come from the Library of Congress are, by and large, the most meritorious from most any standpoint. At all events, they are of a high character and of high grade. If they are handicapped in the matter of funds for printing, it seems to me the Committee on Appropriations ought to take care of that item.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that the current law gives the Congressional Library \$200,000 for printing.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is that the same sum they have had from year to year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the same that they have had for several years.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If they have a shortage it is because of printing other documents of greater importance?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Possibly so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I admit that the sum of \$200,000 is a considerable item. Has the gentleman any information as to how many important documents like the one I have called attention to have been suspended for lack of funds for printing?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I have not. That is a matter that we did not consider in connection with this bill.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, to second with what emphasis I can summon what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has just said. The First and Second Continental Congresses, from the standpoint of our history, occupy a very unique and important period in our country. Prior to this period two attempts had been made by the colonies to come together, the Albany Council in 1754 and the stamp-act congress in 1765. But the Continental Congresses were the first legislative bodies. The first one lasted only about six weeks and came into session in 1774, in September. It announced a Bill of Rights, and then adjourned, to meet again provided England did not heed its requests. The second one came into session the 10th of May, as I remember, 1775, and continued as one body, and covering that very interesting period running through the entire Revolutionary War up to the time of the adoption of the Articles of Confederation, which was the 1st of March, 1781. This body was revolutionary, both in the manner of its authority in assembling and in the power it exercised. It was superseded in 1781, two years before England recognized our independence, by the Congress provided for in the Articles of Confederation, which were adopted under the authority of that Congress. That particular period has no record of any legislative proceedings outside of this record of this Continental Congress. There were about 15 different presidents of these two Congresses, including the country's most famous names. In this connection it is interesting to us to recall that wonderful statement of William Pitt, who, in speaking of this particular Second Continental Congress, said that for wisdom of conclusion, force of sagacity, and solidity of reasoning, that body had never been excelled in the history of the world. The Second Continental Congress covered one of the most interesting periods in the history of legislative life, not only in America but in the world. It was the span that connected the period when 13 separate colonies all exercised more or less legislative power separately, and the same colonies exercised that power as a confederation. For a long time these documents were unpublished. They were in scattered form. Some years ago the Government began to show proper interest in permanent preservation of the records of important proceedings of our fathers in various times of activity. This is one item. These proceedings have been brought together



and published by the Government. The Government has published many documents covering the period of the Constitution, including documentary history of the Constitution. These and other such documents should be placed in every university and college library; it would be very valuable contributions for the study of our early history and should be looked upon as a wonderful achievement. It would seem to me that every Congressman ought to have them in his own library.

Mr. PLATT. Is that the set of some 39 or 40 volumes?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Twenty-three have thus far been published.

Mr. PLATT. There is a whole shelf of them. I have got them.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Those are the ones.

Mr. PLATT. Can not any library get them?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; the publication has been discontinued.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How many volumes were ever printed?

Mr. FESS. I do not remember.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Twenty-three volumes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How many sets?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not know.

Mr. FESS. The proceedings of the First Continental Congress were printed in two volumes, as I now recall—perhaps but one. Those of the Second Congress ran through a period of years and go beyond 20 volumes, as I remember.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman does not know how many sets were published?

Mr. FESS. No; but they could not be very numerous, since only libraries and special history students would demand them. Of course, to a body of men like this they would be valuable.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It seems to me there is a scarcity of them, a limited number of sets being published. They are very valuable and more ought to be published.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For procuring manure, soil, tools, fuel; purchasing trees, shrubs, plants, and seeds; services, including skilled laborers and laborers at not exceeding \$2 per diem; materials and miscellaneous supplies; traveling expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence of the superintendent and his assistants not to exceed \$200; street car tickets not exceeding \$25; office equipment and contingent expenses in connection with repairs and improvements to Botanic Gardens; care and maintenance of motor-propelled delivery vehicle; under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, \$15,000.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask a question in regard to the item which has just been read, referring particularly to that providing for laborers at \$2 per diem. Did those men get the benefit of the last summer increase?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They did. The gentleman refers to the 5 and 10 per cent increase?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They did.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what is going to be done about the removal of the Botanic Garden?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not tell the gentleman. I think there is a bill now pending providing for its removal.

Mr. COX. The bill which we passed through the House never did go through the Senate.

Mr. FESS. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am in a position to give the gentleman some information. In the last Congress, I think it was, we passed through the House a bill providing for the removal of the Botanic Garden and that it be placed in Rock Creek Park. In another body that measure met with opposition, particularly that part which referred to the Botanic Garden proper. A gentleman in the other body, chairman of the committee having the bill in charge, was favorable to the idea of having the arboretum transferred to Rock Creek Park, but was opposed to having the garden proper transferred, and the bill met the usual death that bills meet with when opposed by one person in another body.

Mr. FESS. Does that mean that the garden will remain where it is?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet; but the Botanic Garden, including the fence around it, has been the subject of a good deal of comment of late years—

Mr. FESS. Has it not been ordered taken away?

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). Will remain until both bodies can come to some agreement as to what shall be done. Those who have studied the subject believe that Rock Creek Park is the proper place for the permanent establishment of the Botanic Garden. Sooner or later, as soon as the plans devised by the

Art Commission are developed into fruition, of course the Botanic Garden will have to be removed, but with the large temporary office buildings in Henry Park and the adjoining parks, that, of course, must be postponed until the termination of the war and for some years thereafter.

Mr. FESS. My concern arose from a good deal of talk about the removal of it, and I thought we had once authorized it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill passed through the House after thorough consideration, as I recall, two Congresses ago, but nothing has been done with the proposal since that time.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. How many skilled and unskilled laborers are secured at the price of \$2 per day?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They vary in number. They are not employed, as the gentleman knows, regularly, but as they are needed. Sometimes he has a greater force than at others.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman mean that he can get skilled and unskilled laborers at \$2 for the entire day?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There has been no complaint made by the Superintendent of the Botanic Garden. I will say to the gentleman that up until a year ago the per diem paid to the laborers was \$1.75, but it was increased to \$2 a year ago.

They now get \$2 and the 10 per cent increase which was allowed for the current year.

Mr. TILSON. But wages of laborers in other parts of the country have gone up not 25 per cent but they have gone up 100 per cent.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman will understand, of course, the work required of these particular laborers does not require any particular amount of skill. I fancy that all that is required is one who knows how to handle a hoe or a rake, and, of course, that class of labor is not paid the same sum that is paid to laborers to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. TILSON. My own experience was that ordinary laborers, leaving off the word "skilled," that the ordinary laborers were receiving a much higher wage in most parts of the country than \$2 per day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say there was no complaint of any kind made by the Superintendent of the Botanical Gardens and no request for an increase of the rate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as it is drawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Bureau of Efficiency, authorized by the urgent deficiency appropriation act approved February 28, 1916, to establish and maintain a system of efficiency ratings, to investigate administrative needs of the service relating to personnel in the several executive departments and independent establishments, required by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation acts for the fiscal years 1913 and 1914, respectively, and to investigate duplication of statistical and other work and methods of business in the various branches of the Government service; for purchase or exchange of equipment, supplies, stationery, books and periodicals, printing and binding, traveling expenses not exceeding \$3,000, and street car fare not exceeding \$50; in all, \$110,000: *Provided*, That no persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$4,000 per annum except the chief of the bureau, whose compensation is fixed hereby at the rate of \$5,000 per annum.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I rose to reserve a point of order also on the section.

Mr. HAMLIN. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice in the current law the same item carrying the same amount exactly, but the totals are different, to quote from the current law—

*Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 a year traveling expenses and street car fare not exceeding \$50, in all \$60,000—

But in the present bill the total is \$110,000. How does that come about?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I will say to the gentleman that while the current law carries only \$60,000 there were two deficiencies, one of \$20,000, which would make a total of \$80,000, and the bill which passed the other day carried an amount of \$38,000, which would make \$118,000, which has already been appropriated for this bureau for the current year.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then how did the gentleman happen to reach the figures of \$110,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That was reached in this way, I will say to the gentleman: The estimate submitted to the committee called for \$120,000. Now, the Bureau of Efficiency has been conducting a number of investigations; some of them have been completed and others are about finished, and still others are in contemplation. Among the investigations which the bureau has been conducting is one relating to civil-service retirement,

the bureau having taken up that investigation under express direction of the Senate by resolution.

Now that has been completed and cost something like \$20,000. After full consideration the committee thought that \$110,000 would be sufficient to pay the salaries necessary to be employed in this bureau, and that if it developed next year that they needed more money they would have the privilege of coming back to Congress and submitting their request just as they have done this year.

Mr. HAMLIN. What I especially reserved the point of order on was the increase of salary from four to five thousand dollars per annum for the chief of the bureau. Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, just a word or two not only as to this particular item, but other similar items in this bill. If there are any criticisms, in my judgment, that can be leveled against this bill, it is the fact that the increases of salaries we find in it have been given to those receiving considerable salaries and not to the clerks in the office who do the work, the real labor, and who are receiving only a small amount, not enough really to keep soul and body together in decency. In other words, the bill is top-heavy. I do not believe that is the right attitude for this House to adopt or follow. We find here that the salary of this chief is increased \$1,000 per annum. We do not find that the salaries of any of the employees of this bureau are increased a penny. We find in subsequent portions of the bill, one which just follows this, an increase in the Civil Service Commissioners' salaries, one \$500 and two \$1,000 each per year, without any increase in the wages of a single employee, except four messenger boys, who were given the munificent increase of \$5 per month each.

I do not believe that is right, and that same system seems to run all the way through this bill, and I think unless the clerks in the offices receiving \$900, \$1,000, and \$1,100 and \$1,200, and those receiving less, down to the laborers, who must pay out as much to live as the man at the head of the bureau must pay, I can not conceive why the high-salaried people should get the increases and the rank and file be ignored. I am going to object and raise the point of order against the increase of all salaries ranging from \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000 and up a year unless the clerk who now does the drudgery and gets from \$720 to \$1,200 or a little more is provided for.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that if he will go through the estimates submitted to the committee and then take this bill as reported, he will find that the committee has reported the fewest number of increases of salaries and only in those cases which seemed to the committee to be compelling.

Mr. HAMLIN. Now, if the gentleman will allow me right there, I think the gentleman has put his finger right on the sore spot. When I say this bill should be criticized I do not mean that as a criticism of the members of the committee personally. My criticism goes, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, to the heads of these different departments who make these recommendations, that they make their estimates and make their recommendations to the committee seeking to increase their own salaries and the salaries of others occupying some similar position, and they lose sight entirely or else are indifferent to the clerks who are drawing these small salaries and barely eking out a livelihood. I think that is where the real criticism is deserved.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMLIN. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Do you not think it would weaken their claim for increase, or perhaps have something to do with it, if they recommended an increase for these clerks?

Mr. HAMLIN. If they made too many recommendations possibly none of them would be accepted. They look after number one first, and I do not think that is right. I think that if I am getting a salary of \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year I have a better chance of maintaining myself in some degree of comfort than some one who is drawing only \$1,200 a year or less. I do not mean to say that there are not some men who are worth \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year, while there are some others that are not worth more than \$2,000, perhaps, but these clerks do not make these recommendations and, in fact, do not dare to even make request of the heads of departments for increase. They would be regarded as insubordinate if they were to do so. So the fellows at the head of the departments who are permitted to make these recommendations are not acting fairly by asking an increase of their own salaries and losing sight of the clerks, who really do the hard work. And I am not willing to stand for that kind of business.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN]—and I hope he will not insist on the point of order—that the chief of this bureau did not make any specific request for an increase of his salary. He did

submit an estimate, asking that \$120,000 be appropriated, and that the limitation now existing in the law be taken off. It came to the attention of the committee that there was a likelihood of this very competent man leaving for other service. He is very efficient. He is an accountant of long experience, and there is no question in my mind but that he could secure much larger salary in private employment.

Now, I am sure, if the gentleman from Missouri and if the other members of the committee would take the time to investigate fully just what this bureau has accomplished and what it is now seeking to accomplish, they would be convinced of the fact that the bureau has saved to the Government of the United States many, many, many times more than has been appropriated for it since it was first created. Now, in the first place, I want to say to the gentleman that a few years ago and about the time a number of clerks were brought to the Treasurer's office from the Subtreasuries—

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield right there, just for a suggestion?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is true; but does the gentleman take into consideration the fact that we are in a war and that everybody is called upon to make sacrifices?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. HAMLIN. And does the gentleman also take into consideration the fact that the President issued an Executive order, and I think properly, prohibiting clerks being transferred from one bureau to another during the war where they could get better pay if they were transferred, but that that is not permitted now, for very good and sufficient reasons, and yet we go to work and increase the salaries of the heads of the bureaus but turn a deaf ear to the clerk?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As indicating the value of this particular gentleman, Mr. Herbert D. Brown's service—

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not care anything about who the man is.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A few years ago the Treasurer's office submitted an estimate to the Congress asking for \$213,000 additional for clerical help. I happened to be a member of the subcommittee at the time. On investigation, and in the hearing, the committee became convinced that certain change of method of accounting and disbursing could be put in effect in that office which would do away with the necessity for this greatly increased appropriation. Finally, after considerable discussion and consideration, and with the consent and the entire and hearty approval of the Treasurer, the Bureau of Efficiency was requested to go down to that office and to cooperate with the Treasurer's office in the effort to evolve a different method of transacting the business of that office. And within a week or two the Treasurer came to the committee and submitted a supplemental estimate, in which he cut out the \$213,000, and ultimately his former estimate was reduced \$50,000.

Now, that is one instance, and one instance only, of what this bureau has accomplished for the Government.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, just a minute. Let me get through.

Mr. HAMLIN. In the interest of accuracy I want to ask this question: Is it not true, though, that while what you say may have happened in one particular department or bureau, that the number of clerks in the service of the Government has gradually increased all the time and appropriations increased in amount all the time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That may be owing to increased business, but certainly the gentleman can not charge that up to the Bureau of Efficiency.

Mr. HAMLIN. I do not know whether it is due to increased business or not.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I venture the assertion there is not an office or bureau that has been investigated by this Bureau of Efficiency in which there has not been a resulting decrease in clerks and appropriations required. It may be, as in the case of the Internal Revenue Office, that the appropriations have been greatly increased; but, of course, in that it is due to the fact that we have passed bills providing for the collection of taxes of more than \$3,000,000,000, necessarily requiring a greatly increased force. Now, in addition to that, this Bureau of Efficiency was instructed by Congress to investigate the Indian Bureau and its method of accounting and disbursing. It made an extended investigation in the field, and has reported and recommended a different method of accounting and disbursing in so far as the field service of the Indian Bureau is concerned, which has saved admittedly many thousands of dollars to the Indians to whom those funds belong. Those recommendations will be put into effect by the Indian Bureau.



Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I agree with my friend from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] that I am not very much enamored of these increases of salaries, especially for these high-class men; but in that connection it is not also true that this Bureau of Efficiency in the last Congress was directed to investigate the question of Subtreasuries, and has not that commission made a recommendation which, if Congress will carry it out, will save the Government \$450,000 after the war?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is clearly correct, and I was going to bring that to the attention of the House in a few moments.

Before I get to the point raised by the gentleman from Indiana, however, I want to say that when the present Postmaster General first assumed charge of the Post Office Department, having been a Member of this House and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he was familiar with the work being done by this Bureau of Efficiency, and immediately upon his assuming charge of that department he called the Bureau of Efficiency into the department and asked it to cooperate with him and with the commission appointed by him for the purpose of seeing whether or not efficiency ratings could not be established.

Now, what has been the result of the work done by this bureau in cooperation with the Post Office Department and with the entire and hearty approval of the Postmaster General? It has resulted, gentlemen, in a net decrease of the clerical force of the Post Office Department by 189 persons, drawing salaries annually aggregating \$174,360. That is not for one year, but it has been for several years, and it will continue on and on. So I say it is impossible to estimate just what this Bureau of Efficiency has been worth to the Government since its creation.

The gentleman from Indiana referred to the Subtreasuries. Last year Congress directed the Bureau of Efficiency to investigate whether or not it would be possible to eliminate or discontinue the Subtreasuries. They have submitted a very full, and, I may say, a very able report, which has been published in the form of a document, and I hope that every Member here will get that document and read it carefully before we reach the provisions with reference to Subtreasuries in this bill. They recommend that the Subtreasuries be discontinued after the war, and your committee has followed their recommendation and submitted such a proposition to Congress. Now, as the gentleman from Indiana says, if that provision is adopted it will save \$450,000 a year, not for one year, but for all years to come.

Now, in addition to that, they were called in by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the Director of the War-Risk Bureau when they began to form the organization for that great bureau, having now 1,700 employees and which will be increased to 2,900. The Bureau of Efficiency was requested by the Secretary of the Treasury to go to that particular bureau and assist those in charge in organizing on an efficiency basis; and the Director of the War-Risk Bureau, in his hearings before the committee, paid high tribute to the Bureau of Efficiency, and particularly to its chief, Mr. Brown, for the splendid services he had rendered in assisting to put that bureau upon an efficient basis.

Now, that is not all. Under direction of Congress the Bureau of Efficiency was directed to investigate the methods of business in the Internal Revenue Office. By the entire consent and hearty approval of the present Internal Revenue Commissioner, Mr. Roper, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, this Bureau of Efficiency, with a part of its force, has been for some time in the Internal Revenue Commissioner's office investigating and assisting and cooperating with the Internal Revenue Commissioner in order to put his great force upon the best possible efficiency basis. I am not violating any confidence when I say that I saw a letter from the Internal Revenue Commissioner—in fact, a copy was sent to me, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—in which he took occasion to refer to the work that this Bureau of Efficiency had been doing in his bureau and suggested that the work done by it and the expert knowledge required of those who are capable of doing this kind of work prompted him to say that they ought to receive better salaries at the hands of Congress.

Now, that is not all. A moment ago I referred to the fact that the Senate had passed a resolution directing the Bureau of Efficiency to make investigations with a view of establishing facts concerning the advisability or nonadvisability of putting into effect civil-service retirement legislation. This committee has spent months in the performance of that duty, and I understand it has made its report to the chairman of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service of the Senate. That is not all. This Bureau of Efficiency was directed to investigate and report upon the rates of pay and the question of a reclassification of the employees of this Government, and they have been proceeding with that inquiry and are in a position to make a partial report if not a full report.

Then, in addition to that, they were directed by legislation to cooperate with the Pension Commissioner to determine the value of machines for addressing checks in the Pension Office, the sum of \$4,000 having been appropriated to purchase some necessary machines. Those investigations have been made and the machines have been purchased.

Gentlemen, these are some of the things that this Bureau of Efficiency has accomplished, and I say without fear of successful contradiction by anyone who has carefully investigated the great work that has been done by this bureau that it has saved hundreds of thousands of dollars to this Government. For my part, I would not deny a single necessary dollar to a bureau of efficiency such as this, charged as it is with the duty of investigating the expenditures of the people's money, making investigations for Congress, and rendering aid in placing the departments of our Government on the best possible business and efficiency basis.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman permit me right there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Neither am I seeking to withhold from that bureau whatever money is necessary for them to carry on their work, but the committee seems not to have been solicitous about anybody in that bureau, those who are doing the actual work, except the chief himself, and you want to raise his salary.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that there is absolutely no limitation placed on the pay of employees there, and never has been, except the \$4,000 limitation.

Mr. HAMLIN. I venture the assertion that they are not getting any more than the average clerks receive.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Dr. Holcomb, who was professor of government in Harvard University is now drawing \$3,600 under this appropriation. He is a man of splendid experience and training.

Mr. HAMLIN. You are not seeking to raise his salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; but if this is provided the chief of the bureau will get \$5,000 and the other employees of that bureau will get under \$4,000. I think there are about 30 employees in that bureau, and my impression is that their average compensation is about \$2,700 or \$2,800.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are 10 of the employees of this bureau who receive \$3,000 and over. In the administration of this bureau it is very necessary to have high-priced men of rare ability. The commercial world to-day is demanding and paying salaries of twice the amount that these people are receiving from the Government, and it is most difficult to retain in the Government service these accountants, who are being sought after by accounting concerns and others to assist them in the preparation of their income-tax returns and war-profits returns. That is the testimony before our committee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that in the aviation department and possibly in the War Department there are accountants now who are drawing from \$4,000 to \$6,000 a year. In fact, the Civil Service Commission are holding an examination now for accountants, some of whom will get \$6,000 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The testimony before the committee shows that in the department where there is no limit on the amount which may be paid for the services of experts war conditions to-day demand and they are paying the salaries paid in commercial lines, which are above \$4,000 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In determining the salary of a chief of a bureau in framing a bill of this magnitude the committee must take into consideration the pay of the chiefs of the bureaus of other departments. If you scan this bill you will find no instance—there may be an exceptional case—where any chief of a bureau receives less than \$5,000. The Commissioner General of the Land Office receives \$5,000; the Commissioner of Indian Affairs

receives \$5,000; the Commissioner of Pensions, \$5,000; the Commissioner of Patents, \$5,000. The same is true of the head of the Bureau of Immigration and the head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It has been the rule, and the subcommittee has been very careful when they do find themselves impelled by conditions to raise a salary, never to go above the salary that is provided for like positions in other departments.

Now, what were the conditions that presented themselves to the committee so far as the increase of the salary of this valuable man at the head of this great bureau is concerned? The Members know that a few years ago this was a branch of the Civil Service Commission. It was hampered in its work while a division of that commission. The Committee on Appropriations thought it wise, so that they would not be restricted in activity, so that they could go into any department of the Government at the direction of Congress and investigate conditions there, to make it an independent bureau. So three years ago we established the Bureau of Efficiency and placed the salary of the head of that bureau at \$4,000.

The salary list for the men in the employ of that bureau shows that 10 are employed above \$3,000, 1 at \$3,800, 2 at \$3,600; and others between \$3,600 and \$3,000, and 10, I believe, employed at a salary of between \$2,000 and \$3,000. That is the practical situation that confronted us. We have a man at the head of the bureau who is in charge of this responsible work having men receiving a salary of \$3,800 and \$3,600 under him. Instances have been cited by the chairman of the subcommittee where men have been loaned to the bureau for work in this exigency who can receive more money in the commercial world, but who are willing to come here and aid the Government at the statutory salary. Here we have only \$200 difference between the salary of the head of the bureau and the employees, with responsibility of work the value of which can not be counted, as narrated by the chairman of the committee, that is saving the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars, and at present engaged in other work of an independent character that will result in a great saving, receiving but \$4,000, out of proportion to the salary paid to the head of the bureau in charge of responsibilities similar to those with which this bureau is charged.

The gentleman makes the unwarranted charge against the report of the committee on this bill that we have given more consideration to the higher-class officials and not sufficient consideration to the salaries of the clerks. There is no appropriation bill that is presented to Congress that involves the detail that this bill does. It relates to the clerks and officials in all the executive departments of the Government and also to the legislative and judicial branches as well. The hearings show that the head of this bureau, when pressed by the exigencies of the committee, was called to investigate the wages being paid throughout the country to the employees in the commercial and industrial establishments of a similar grade of work to those provided in this bill; that he worked until beyond midnight in order to prepare a chart of the pay of the different classes so that the committee would have some reliable information upon which to act in determining the percentage of increase that the committee would recommend to this House for all Government employees to receive by reason of the high cost of living.

What did that chart show? It showed that the Government to-day for similar work was paying higher wages in the clerical grade of \$1,200 and under than is paid in private establishments, and that in the grade from \$1,600 to \$1,800 the Government for that character of work is paying somewhat less. But that the Government had been paying more even in those grades prior to the time when there was a rapid increase in private employment occasioned by the withdrawal of men in commercial employment into the war. The head of that bureau devoted hour after hour in the preparation of that character of work. The Postmaster General has given him a letter of credit—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. RUCKER. Reserving the right to object, I want to say that when the gentleman from Wisconsin gets through I hope to get the eye of the Chair, because the committee has had about time enough on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. So, Mr. Chairman, the committee can not be charged with presenting a bill that is any way top-heavy. In fact, we have not increased the salary of the high grade of individuals except in a very few instances, and this is one which I believe can be well defended, and has been well defended by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Of course, the gentleman understands that I did not mean to be severe in my criticisms. The fact is, however, I find that the bill bears out the statement I have made, that a majority of the increases have been in the higher offices, and not in the little ones.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I have here a statement made by the clerk of our committee, comprising 21 typewritten pages, containing the increases recommended by the committee. I read that over closely last evening, and I shall loan it to the gentleman so that he may have at his command the increases recommended in the bill. If he will go through the pages he will find that the recommendations made by the committee have been, first, that we have leveled up every laboring man who was receiving less than the statutory pay and put him at the statutory rate. He will also find that we have increased the pay of artisans, and he will also find that in the lower grades of clerks of a thousand dollars, twelve hundred dollars, fourteen hundred dollars, we have in the respective departments made increases, and in addition to that we have made those increases in those lower grades with the full contemplation that this committee would bring in a more favorable recommendation for a horizontal percentage increase to all of the employees than it did last year.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, of course I can not nor can any other Member anticipate what the committee will do in the future. I am talking about this bill. Take the Civil Service Commission. The committee has recommended an increase of \$500 to the president of that commission and a thousand dollars increase to each one of the other two commissioners. Of the over 100 clerks in that bureau alone you have recommended to four messenger boys an increase of \$5 a month each. Does not that bear out my statement that this bill is "top-heavy"?

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not, because the gentleman speaks only a half truth.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is absolutely the whole truth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. We provide in the Civil Service Commission for additional employees to the amount of \$150,000.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am not talking about additional employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it is under that omnibus clause that we can provide additional help at increased salaries. If the gentleman wants the specific information as to the Civil Service Commission and what we did as to those lower-grade clerks I will call attention to just what we did. The gentleman says that the only increase was with some messenger boys. Permit me to call his attention to the fact—and I hope the gentleman will give me his attention, having asked me the question—

Mr. HAMLIN. I shall be delighted to give the gentleman my undivided attention.

Mr. STAFFORD. Last year we provided 6 of class 4, which is the \$1,800 grade, in the Civil Service Commission. This year we increase that grade to 9. Last year we provided 28 of class 3—

Mr. HAMLIN. The print I have reads "6 at \$1,800," just the same as it is in the current law.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman has not the amended form of the bill. They have two bills here, one for the committee and one for the lay Members of the House.

Mr. HAMLIN. Oh, is that it? I have the bill furnished me at the desk.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not the bill.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is identical with the current law.

Mr. MADDEN. That is not the bill they are considering.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the aid of the additional information furnished by the genial gentleman from Illinois, of course, it is not necessary for us to say much further, but the fact is that we have provided additional help and allowances for the Civil Service Commission to meet their needs.

Mr. HAMLIN. But it is also true that you recommend increase in pay only for the heads of the bureau and not for the clerks.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. RUCKER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois were a member of this great and august, this most powerful and almost arrogant committee, I would surrender the floor—

Mr. MADDEN. But since I am not, I bow in reverence to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RUCKER. I could tell from the genial smile on the gentleman's face to whom reference has just been made that he is not a member of that committee. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat perplexed over this—

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry to hear that. [Laughter.]



Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman is always sympathetic. Mr. Chairman, here in the last few minutes discussion has clustered around items of increases of compensation and, as suggested by my colleague [Mr. HAMLIN], and I think, with all deference to others, that it looks like his suggestion is well founded, though, of course, it can not be true—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield? That must be due to the fact the gentleman is from Missouri, and you have got to show him. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois lives very close to Missouri, and if he will just cross the Mississippi River he will be shown.

Mr. Chairman, the suggestion has been made, and I think correctly, that it seems in some way or another some great chieftain, some man who presides over a great bureau, perhaps the Bureau of Efficiency, may make a more vivid and more lasting impression upon the minds and hearts of gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations than men who do the real drudgery which gives fame to those chieftains.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman from Missouri say the "hearts" of members of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. RUCKER. I did that in deference to the members because they have the forms of human beings, I want to say by way of parentheses. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, members of that committee vie with each other in fervid eloquence, deep pathos, and much enthusiasm, occupying the floor most of the time, in defending their bill, which, I think, is subject to a good deal of just criticism. The distinguished and worthy gentleman from Tennessee, having this bill in charge, talked eloquently and forcefully—

Mr. MADDEN. And mightily.

Mr. RUCKER. And made a speech wonderful for its depth and breadth and length, and especially for its length—

Mr. MADDEN. And vision.

Mr. RUCKER. In defending his committee's action. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] came to his rescue and held the floor during two or three extensions of his time.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman be able to select a man who could come to his rescue in any better form?

Mr. RUCKER. Admirably, sir; admirably; it was a wonderful defense, and yet, Mr. Chairman, within the hour a most distinguished and learned Member of this Congress stood before this committee and detailed to us the incomparable achievements of a man who is not drawing a great salary, a man who could only have acquired the inexhaustible store of valuable information he has accumulated and which he imparts to the Members of this House and of the Senate of the United States and others every day, by long, assiduous, faithful, patient toil and struggle, and yet, when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] is appealed to, appealed to pathetically by gentlemen on this side of the aisle and gentlemen on that side, while admitting all the facts recited and conceding the force of the arguments made, he tells us that by reason of the ironclad rules of the Committee on Appropriations, by which he is fettered and bound, his manhood—no, I will not say that, but will say his judgment as a Member of this House—is taken from him, that he is compelled to obey the mandates of that committee, and therefore he must insist upon the point of order and prevent the House from considering meritorious amendments.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. In one minute. And when a gentleman from this side of the aisle, a member of the Appropriations Committee, ran across the aisle with hands stretched out pathetically and earnestly pleading, "My friend, after we voted on this question information came to me that I did not know before," the gentleman from Tennessee, determined in his way, and autocratic in his will, entrenched behind the orders of this great and powerful committee, said, "Oh, I knew all about those things." Yes; the gentleman from Tennessee knew how many boys this man working for a meager salary had given to his country to be sent to the war; he knew his long and faithful service; he knew the pitiful salary he was being paid, and yet he said, "I passed on all those questions and determined that \$1,500 was enough for him." But when we reach this item he pleads with us that because a secretary of one of the departments of Government said the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency did a great work and saved the country large sums of money, we should yield to the wisdom and bow with respectful deference to the action of the Committee on Appropriations, though its action is without authority or sanction of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, but I ask the indulgence of the committee for a few minutes longer.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. RUCKER. Five minutes, and if I do not use that the committee will not censure me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. It might be interesting to know that the young assistant of Mr. Washington has been called to the Ordnance Department, leaving a salary of \$1,200 over here, and he is now being paid \$2,400.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman says it might be interesting to me to know that?

Mr. FESS. It might be interesting to the committee.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman is too wise to indulge that forlorn hope. I doubt if the gentleman, with all his learning, can suggest anything interesting to the committee, unless he suggests absolute submission to its will.

Mr. Chairman, I speak with great respect of the Committee on Appropriations. I concede to them for the moment, although I may not abide in that concession, that it is the embodiment of all the wisdom and all the patriotism of the House. I say I might concede it, and to do so would not offend the committee, but I will not concede it. I do concede that it is a great committee, each member possessing a towering intellect and each a loyal, faithful public servant. But the trouble is we have allowed ourselves to drift into a rut, a rut that the Democrats fell heir to as an inheritance of the old party which we succeeded in power, a custom of allowing committees to write into a bill what it desires and to keep out of a bill everything not in harmony with its sweet will; and I tell you, in the language of Shakespeare, "It is a custom more honored in the breach than in the observance." We allow the committees of the House to domineer and rule the House. If the time should ever come when the baseless accusations against us shall be true and this House does in fact become a worthless and useless body, it will be because we shall have degenerated into a lot of moral cowards, afraid to do the things we know ought to be done, and ignominiously cringe and bow to the autocratic will of some chairman or subchairman of a committee. I for one am determined to break the shackles which some committees attempt to put on me if I have manhood and power left to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I take it the point of order has been made. But I want to announce now that it is my purpose, the point reserved is not adhered to, to make the point of order myself. I will not remain silent merely because gentlemen cry, "High taxes, great burdens, enormous expenses of war," and give these as reasons for their action and as a response to the piteous wails that come to us from the poor when I observe them turn to the other side and grasp hands with a man who is drawing a higher salary than others performing equally valuable services, living in the same community, and having to bear the same kind of living expense. If I can discover them, I will make a point of order against every proposed increase of salary where the salary is already fixed at a high figure, until the committee shows some disposition to respond to the cry of those who really need help. But the trouble is you can not find them. It takes an expert to locate one of these items. Nobody but the chief of the Efficiency Bureau can tell what is in the bill.

We ought to quit carrying barbers on the pay roll of this Government as laborers. Gentlemen may declaim and proclaim as much as they please that these barbers—these laborers, as designated in this bill—work themselves to death trying to keep this Hall clean when Congress is not in session, but the question arises, if they are laborers, why are qualified barbers, and only barbers eligible for appointment to those places? Strange to say, here in this bill we provide pay for common laborers, but before you get on the eligible list to fill one of these positions you have got to be a barber. Why, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this great committee [Mr. SHERLEY], the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee], nor his able assistant on that side of the aisle [Mr. STAFFORD], neither one of them could qualify as common laborers within the meaning of the words as used in this bill, because they are not barbers. They may shave us—and I think they do sometimes—but they do not use lather in doing it. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if these men are to be carried on the roll, they ought to be carried as barbers, or else gentlemen ought to come out like men in the open and say to the American people, "We have some particular pets"—God knows, they are not mine—"and we are paying them under the guise of laborers out of the public crib, but they really are barbers and nothing more." But for fear some one would be lacerated and torn at home these barbers are concealed under the more attractive term of "common laborers."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

This has been a delightfully interesting day. The speeches of the committeemen have been edifying and instructive, and it seems to me that in view of all the good things they have said and the information they have imparted, and the intelligence they have displayed, and in view of the progress the committee has made in this work, those of us who are not members of the committee ought to be given a chance to go home and study over the words of wit and wisdom that have been uttered. And I therefore raise the question of no quorum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield just a minute? Why could we not dispose of this?

Mr. MADDEN. I think we ought to adjourn. The gentleman has taken up all the afternoon making speeches.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say something in reply to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. MADDEN. I think you can do that to-morrow. I want to make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes the point of no quorum. Evidently the point is well taken.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6361. An act to extend protection to the civil rights of members of the Military and Naval Establishments of the United States engaged in the present war

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHOUSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10477) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 357), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 10468) to authorize the opening of a minor street from Georgia Avenue to Ninth Street NW., through squares 2875 and 2877, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 10469) to prescribe the personnel of the Navy Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment, and the method of appointment therein, the pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps, and the conditions under which they may be retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 10470) providing medals for certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 10471) to amend section 3279, Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10472) to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 10473) to define necessary skilled labor engaged in necessary agricultural enterprise for the purposes of the selective draft, and to authorize the Secretary of War to grant furloughs with or without pay and allowances to

enlisted men of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10474) to authorize and direct the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10475) for the establishment of a uniform system of weights and measures in the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. VOLSTEAD: A bill (H. R. 10476) authorizing the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota to establish standards for the grading of grain in said States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 10478) to amend section 35 of the Criminal Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 258) providing for an increase of pay to the custodian employees of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) providing for the appointment of a committee by Congress to assess the value of the Carlyle House, located in the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 10477) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 10479) providing medals for certain persons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10480) granting an increase of pension to Arvilla L. Briggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENTON: A bill (H. R. 10481) granting an increase of pension to Isaac A. Lockwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10482) granting an increase of pension to John Neavill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10483) granting a pension to Earl P. Ridgman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10484) granting a pension to Fred Craig; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 10485) granting a pension to J. A. Beaumont; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10486) granting an increase of pension to Zerah T. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 10487) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Stoops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10488) granting a pension to Harold A. Salisbury; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 10489) granting an increase of pension to William Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10490) granting an increase of pension to Wedding Colgate; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10491) to correct the military record of Cyrus Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 10492) granting an increase of pension to Susan S. Theall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 10493) granting an increase of pension to Eli McMinnis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10494) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. McNeal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10495) granting an increase of pension to Abraham H. Caylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10496) granting an increase of pension to John Charles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10497) granting an increase of pension to M. L. K. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10498) granting an increase of pension to William P. Dorton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 10499) granting a pension to Ethel A. Kane; to the Committee on Pensions.



Also, a bill (H. R. 10500) granting a pension to Adell O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 10501) granting an increase of pension to James Buggie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10502) granting a pension to Mertilla Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 10503) granting an increase of pension to Richard G. Paynter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10504) granting an increase of pension to Elijah L. Wyatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10505) granting an increase of pension to Kendal J. Warrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10506) granting an increase of pension to Joshua J. Daisey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10507) granting an increase of pension to Alfred P. Pepper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10508) granting an increase of pension to Joshua S. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10509) granting an increase of pension to John T. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10510) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Messick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10511) granting an increase of pension to John H. Walls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10512) granting an increase of pension to Joshua J. Workman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10513) granting an increase of pension to Molten R. Pepper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10514) granting an increase of pension to John H. Swain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10515) granting an increase of pension to Zachariah W. McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10516) granting an increase of pension to John J. Morath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10517) granting an increase of pension to John W. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10518) granting an increase of pension to James P. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10519) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. Bennum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10520) granting an increase of pension to George A. Coverdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10521) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson O'Hara; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Missouri State Board of Health, urging the passage of House bill 9563, regarding military rank of Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of students of the short course in agriculture, opposing proposed amendment to the farm-loan act, and asking that the law remain as it is; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also (by request), petition of members of the Good Hope Farmers' Club, New Haven, Mo., urging an increase of the minimum price of wheat and other farm products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also (by request), petition of 13 women of Middletown, Mo., urging the closing of the breweries for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a resolution of a Mooney mass meeting, held in Los Angeles, Cal., asking justice for Rena Mooney and Israel Weinberg and their associates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Resolutions of the Brooklyn Surgical Society, favoring the bill to give advanced rank to medical officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: Resolution adopted by Washington Camp, No. 826, Patriotic Sons of America, Carmichaels, Pa., favoring prohibition of the manufacture of intoxicating liquors during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Resolution of the New York Zoological Society, favoring the migratory-bird treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Pharmaceutical Service Association, favoring H. R. 5531, to provide a pharmaceutical corps in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles Bulfer and other citizens of Peru, Ill., favoring a bill for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Woman's Association of Commerce of Chicago, Ill., urging equal pay for women workers, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of New York Zoological Society, urging passage of the migratory-bird treaty bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cushman's Automatic Tool Co., of Champaign, Ill., opposing taking the rate-making power from the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petitions of Jennie Hanlon and Etta Stangle, of Denver, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 6857, for the relief of Richard A. Schwab; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Ladies' Auxiliary, Connaught Social and Benevolent Association, of San Francisco, Cal., urging a report from committee on joint resolution 204 in regard to Irish freedom, by Miss RANKIN, and open debate on the floor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of John H. Harmanson, of Baltimore, Md., opposing the Johnson rent bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition opposing the increased rates on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Association of Letter Carriers, favoring legislation for permanent increase of pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Baltimore Federation of Labor, opposing Borland eight-hour amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Thomas S. Cullen of Baltimore, Md., favoring House bill 9563, giving rank to enlisted surgeons in Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baltimore Lodge, No. 70, Loyal Order of Moose, favoring House bill 7364; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Baltimore (Md.) Branch, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, urging the passage of bill to increase pay of post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Charles D. Sullivan, of Baltimore, Md., against the Borland eight-hour law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. T. Wade, president Baltimore County Medical Association, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3748 and House bill 9563; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the New York Zoological Society, urging the immediate passage of the enabling act providing regulations for the enforcement by the United States of the treaty with Canada for the protection of North American migratory birds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of members of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Port Ewen, N. Y., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 6, 1918.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1918.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smith, Md.
Dillingham	Kendrick	Phelan	Smith, S. C.
Gallinger	Kenyon	Pittman	Smoot
Gerry	King	Ransdell	Stone
Hale	Kirby	Robinson	Swanson
Hardwick	Lodge	Saulsbury	Tillman
Henderson	McCumber	Shafroth	Townsend
Hollis	McLean	Sheppard	Underwood
Johnson, Cal.	McNary	Sherman	Vardaman
Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Simmons	Watson
Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smith, Ariz.	Williams

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.